

OUT OF THE DARKNESS AND INTO THE LIGHT:

A STUDY OF
INAUTHENTIC AND AUTHENTIC SPEECH

A Thesis

Presented to the Graduate School
of Brock University

As partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Donna McKernan

September, 1976

Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter I	7
Chapter II	35
Chapter III	72
Conclusion	116

To my mentor, Dr. Wm. J. Langan (California State
University, Hayward), with whom this journey began:
...whose search for truth and wisdom called me to
my own task and lit the way.

Introduction

Man can be described as the being who shows himself in speech, and from birth to death is continually speaking. Communication is so close to us, so woven into our very being, that we have little understanding of the way it is constituted; for it is as hard to obtain distance from communication as it is to obtain distance from ourselves. All communication is not alike. There are two basic modes¹ of communication, the inauthentic and the authentic, between which there occurs a constant tension.

It is in the inauthentic mode, points out Heidegger, that we find ourselves "proximately and for the most part";

1. Being and Time, pg. 68

Dasein decides as to the way it will comport itself in taking up its task of having being as an issue for it. "...it can, in its very being 'choose' itself and win itself; it can also lose itself and never win itself or only "seem" to do so. But only in so far as it is essentially something which can be authentic--that is, something of its own--can it have lost itself and not yet won itself."

therefore Heidegger also terms it "everydayness".² Caught up in the world of everydayness, our speaking covers over and conceals³ our rootedness in being, leaving us in the darkness of untruth. The image of darkness may be inferred from Heidegger's use of the image of "clearing"⁴ to depict being as

2. *ibid.* pg. 69

"Dasein's average everydayness, however, is not to be taken as a mere 'aspect'. Here too, and even in the mode of inauthenticity, the structure of existentiality lies a priori and here too Dasein's being is an issue for it in a definite way; and Dasein comports itself towards it the mode of average everydayness, even if this is only the mode of fleeing in the face of it and forgetfulness thereof."

3. *ibid.* pg. 59

"covering over" and "concealing" are ways Dasein tries to flee its task of having being as an issue for itself. "...This being can be covered up so extensively that it becomes forgotten and no question arises about it or its meaning..." How everyday speaking accomplishes this will be taken up in detail in the second chapter which explores Dasein's everyday speech.

4. *ibid.* pg. 171

"...we have in mind nothing other than the Existential - ontological structure of this entity (Dasein), that it is in such a way as to be its 'there'. To say that it is 'illuminated' ["erleuchtet"] means that as Being-in-the-world it is cleared [gelichtet] in itself, not through any other entity, but in such a way that it is itself the clearing. Only for an entity which is existentially cleared in this way does what is present-at-hand become accessible in the light or hidden in the dark. ..."

dis-coveredness and truth. Our first task will be to explore the nature of communication in general and then to explore each of the modes manifested in turn. The structure of the inauthentic mode of communication can be explored by asking the following questions: What is this speaking about? Who is it that is speaking and who is spoken to? Does this speaking show man in his speech?

The authentic mode is distinguished by the rarity with which we encounter it; as the inauthentic conceals, so the authentic reveals our rootedness in being. Yet this rarity makes it difficult to delineate its elusive structure clearly. Its constituent elements can be brought into focus by asking the same questions of this mode that we previously asked of the inauthentic mode.

Our initial response to the disclosure of the authentic mode is to attempt to abandon the inauthentic mode and leave the darkness behind dwelling only in the "lighted place". All through the ages, some men pushing this to extreme, have, upon uncovering their relatedness to being, experienced a deep longing to dwell in such a "place" of pure truth and oft times denigrated or attempted to exclude the everyday world. Such

flight is twice mistaken: first it attempts to fix truth as unchanging and static and secondly, it opposes this to untruth which it seeks to abolish. This is both the wrong view of truth and the wrong view of untruth as Heidegger points out in The

Origin of The Work of Art:

The Way-to-be of truth, i.e., of discoveredness, is under the sway of refusal. But this refusal is no lack or privation, as if truth could be simply discoveredness rid of all covers. If it could be that, it would no longer be itself. ...Truth in its way-to-be is untruth.⁵

Pure light is not the nature of Being nor is pure unconcealedness possible for man. Failure to remember this is the failure to realize that communication destroys itself in such flight because it no longer maintains the contingency of its task, i.e., the dis-closedness of being.

We are reminded of the strong attraction this flight from darkness held for Plato. Light, truth and Being are all beyond the darkness and have nothing to do with it. In Book VII of the Republic, Socrates' explanation of the Allegory of the Cave to Glaucon points to a decided preference men have for the "lighted place".

5. The Origin Of The Work Of Art, pg. 42

Come then, I said, and join me in this further thought, and do not be surprised that those who attained to this height are not willing to occupy themselves with the affairs of men, but their souls ever feel the upward urge and yearning for that sojourn above. For this, I take it, is likely if in this point too the likeliness of our image holds. ⁶

Despite the attraction to pure truth, human communication is more complex than putting down one mode of communication and picking up another. Due to the fact that we are always on the way, the title of my thesis will have to be amended: OUT OF THE DARKNESS AND INTO THE LIGHT--AGAIN AND AGAIN. It must be this way because this is what it means to be human. This is the point made by Mephisto to Faust in pointing out that man, standing between God and the devil, needs both darkness and light:

Er findet sich in einem ewigen Glanze,
 Uns hat er in die Finsternis gebracht,
 Und euch taugt einzig Tag und Nacht.⁷

6. Republic, (517 c & d)

It should be noted however, that while the philosopher-king must be compelled to return to the cave for purely political reasons, once he has taken adequate view of the "brightest region of being" he has the full truth and his return to darkness adds nothing to the truth.

7. Faust, pg. 188

This thesis proposes to examine the grounds that give rise to communication, uncovering the structure of its inauthentic and authentic modes and paying close attention to their inter-relationship and to their relationship to language as "the house of Being": language that both covers and opens up man's rootedness in Being, transforming him as he moves along his way, taking up his "ownmost task" of becoming who he is.

Chapter I

All Communication Arises Out of Being

Man (Dasein) misunderstands the nature of communication altogether. He does so because he has forgotten his ontological roots. He is the being who shows himself in speech; this showing is a two-fold revelation that reflects his forgetfulness or remembrance of his rootedness in being.

Man comes into an already existent world and is addressed¹ through things in the world which are constituted as objects by us in their givenness. This requires our response and means that man is first of all a listener before he is a speaker. "Hearing is constitutive for discourse."² Listening can listen to what is being said or it can listen away (hinhören).³ If such listening is inattentive then speaking in response will be distorted because it has not heard the speaker or what is spoken about. When such listening attends to what the speaking concerns

1. Being and Time, pg. 53

2. *ibid*, pg. 206

3. *ibid*, pg. 207

appropriately, listening constitutes harkening (Hörchen)⁴ i.e., listening which understands. The way Dasein listens will determine how it will speak. ,

Dasein grasps the world through speech which represents the world in words. Here, grasp may be understood in two ways; either as mastery or as response. If it is understood as mastery, the world is seen in its objectivity as out there, as other and not mine; it is to be subjugated. Speech becomes manipulative in order to keep things from being seen as what they are, and thereby covers over being. Being is covered over when speech fails to show or illustrate the entities named in the word in their referential totality:

Men have always to do with being in that they are always dealing with entities*, it is alien to them in that they turn away from being because they do not grasp it...they are awake in relation to the entities, and yet being is hidden from them... They thrash about amid the entities, always supposing that what is most tangible is what

4. ibid, pg. 316

* The substitution of the word, "entities" for "essents" is due to the fact that there is no such word as "essents" in the English language.

they must grasp and each man grasps what is closest to him. The one holds to this, the other to that, each man's opinion hinges on his own opinionatedness. This opinionatedness, this obstinacy prevents them from reaching out to what is gathered together in itself, makes it impossible to be followers.⁵

The word confines the thing to the ontic level by ignoring the relationship of the thing to other things and to Dasein itself. This dis-regard for the totality of relationships will become more clear as we proceed. Man as speaker is in un-truth or conceals being. By contrast, response as a way of grasping the world, grants the world its worldhood and considers (sides with) the entities, in the sense of caring for them, by allowing them to show themselves as what they are. Rather than covering over being as in the case of mastery, response re-addresses the entities by making a place for their essence to be seen. Man remembers his ontological roots and is in truth, a-letheia, discovering being. This journey of dis-covery is not an instantaneous one, rather, Dasein moves gradually along its way from the ontic to the ontological--from forgetfulness to remembrance. So too, our own inquiry must pass gradually from

5. Introduction to Metaphysics, pg. 110

exploring the mastery of everyday speech that is forgetful, to responsive speaking that remembers its rootedness in being.

We might note that a distinction has emerged in the use of speech that might help further our understanding of the nature of communication: "speaking" that covers over should be termed talk or talking while that which reveals being should be termed saying or speaking. Man is the cross-road for both possibilities; the way is always open to him to return to the path of discovery; for he has lost sight of himself as speaker, covering over his own task of becoming, i.e., coming into being:

...For to be a man is to speak. Man says yes and no only because in his profound essence he is a speaker, the speaker. That is his distinction and at the same time his burden. ...(Even if man were as the gods in all other respects)...and did not include the power of speech, all entities would be closed to us, the entities that we ourselves are no less than the entities that we are not.⁶

Man loses sight of himself as speaker because there is an already existent speech into which man is thrown, which has pre-determined structures and meanings. Things are viewed and spoken of in traditional ways, dissipating the power of speech.

6. ibid, pg. 69

The historicity out of which speech expressed the truth of man's encounter with the world has long been covered over in its public appropriation and been lost. Such talk has lost its way of bringing the happening to bear or illustrating it in its essential nature; all that is left are empty words:

But the emptiness of the word "being", the total disappearance of its appellative force, is not merely a particular instance of exhaustion of speech; rather the destroyed relation to being as such is the actual reason for the general misrelation to speech.⁷

Words are the frame of an empty house in which no one lives. Who resides there? Not the speaker; nor is what is spoken about its furnishings. The speaker is everyone and no one at all. The talk is about everything and nothing at all. This emptiness is covered over by generating more and more empty words which stand row on row like uncompleted houses of an abandoned subdivision. In showing himself "as the entity which talks"⁸, words pour forth from man in streams. It is almost as if the bankruptcy

7. ibid, pg. 42

8. Being and Time, pg. 208

of such talk were kept at a distance by the sheer volume of words. Man sees this talking as setting himself apart from all other being, thereby granting himself superior status. The ability to speak is the condition for being human.

The advent of the word manifests the sovereignty of man. Man interposes a network of words between the world and himself and thereby becomes master of the world.⁹

Mastery of the world lies in man's command of speech.¹⁰ He dominates speech by confining it to the ontic level. To speak is to name things, but naming things under man's domination of speech distorts naming. In naming things, familiar objects are locked into a pre-determined form that designates how entities are to give themselves. Only so much of what is given is to be considered. What is left out of this naming is the thinghood of

9. Speaking, pg. 7

10. Poetry, Language* and Thought, pg. 146

* See discussion of the substitution of the word "speech" for "language" on pg. 30. Hereafter this title will be translated as Poetry, Speech and Thought.

"...there rages about the earth an unbridled and yet clever talking, writing, broadcasting of spoken words. Man acts as though he were the shaper and master of speech; while in fact speech remains the master of man. Perhaps it is before all else man's subversion of this relation of dominance that drives his nature into alienation."

the thing. It is no longer to be considered. To insure this distance, entities are considered apart from the way they are in their totality. The unity of the thing is kept at bay-- kept from its gatheredness. The denial of the thinghood empties the word by suppressing the being of the thing so it can't be gathered. Things are looked at in terms of only this or that attribute or purpose. The control over phenomena forces the world to be grasped at the ontic level. For example, trees are seen in terms of being building supply material, men solely in terms of the work they produce e.g., painting, teaching or legislating. Our words allow only this to be seen and no more-- thus we close ourselves off from the world by depriving it of its worldhood. We lose the world by severing the thinghood from the thing. "The nature of the thing never gets a hearing".¹¹

Man does indeed name things in his speaking; but if this speaking is manipulative, it cannot show the nature of a thing in an un-concealed manner because such speaking does not show the thing in its thinghood. This way of speaking Heidegger

11. *ibid*, pg. 170

attributes to science's way of speaking of things which is after all correct for science speaking scientifically.¹² This abstraction of the thinghood from the thing is incorrect when carried over into that speaking which is a-scientific. Our mania for a purely objective world, detached from the kind of thought that refuses such abstraction and refuses as well to be insistent,¹³ has become a point of pride. The distance we put between ourselves and things insures that they (things) will not remind us of their thinghood and in return require us to re-address them out of our own essence or way to be. The flight from naming that reveals, that is not manipulative, is shown in the fairy tale, "Rumpelstiltskin".

Rumpelstiltskin strikes a bargain with the queen: If she

12. *ibid*

13. Introduction to Metaphysics, pg. 138

The problem of insistence is a persistent one and one we shall have to return to in the following chapters. Dasein's insistence manifests itself as arrogance and presumption in imposing its will that entities be considered on the ontic level. "The evaluation of being-human as arrogance and presumption in the pejorative sense takes man out of his essential need as the in-cident. To judge in this way is to take man as something already-there, to put something into an empty space and appraise it according to some external table of values...".

can guess his name in three days time she can keep the child he has come to take.¹⁴ The queen searches throughout the kingdom for someone who knows his name but no one does. The "little man" himself gives his name away; he names his nature; Rumpelstiltskin means hobgoblin. Is Rumpelstiltskin's rage the result of losing the child or is it because in his being named, his nature is exposed thereby placing him in the queen's power? The power humans have is the power of dis-closure. Disclosure holds the entity forth as what it is. Because Rumpelstiltskin is not a thing but an "evil creature", his nature can't bear the light of revelation and he flees. He becomes part of the earth by partially sinking into it; if this weren't far enough from the light of dis-closure, he takes his free leg and tears himself asunder, severing himself from the earth. His flight reflects man's own avoidance of being. As we shall see later, man flees the being there of this being by seeking to become a thing and losing himself in the dispersal he reserves for things at the ontic level. He covers over their being and his own as well.

14. Grimm's Fairy Tales, pg. 51

Where Rumpelstiltskin succeeds in annihilation, man reveals the possibility for recovery; even his covering over discloses being. But what exactly does this mean? We have mentioned "covering over" in the introduction and this chapter without being quite clear as to its nature. We must also answer the question as to just how "covering over" being can at the same time reveal or disclose being.

"Covering over" is an activity, so it must have an initiator. This initiator is man. What is it that man covers over? The answer of course, is being; but further elaboration is needed here. Dasein, in his dis-regard for being refuses to let entities be seen in their thinghood, absents himself from the referential totality by hiding, disguising or burying it.

There are various ways in which phenomena can be covered up. In the first place, a phenomenon can be covered up in the sense that it is still quite undiscovered. It is neither known nor unknown. Moreover a phenomenon can be buried over [verschüttet]. This means that it has at some time been discovered but at some point has deteriorated [verfiel] to the point of getting covered up again. This covering-up can be complete; or rather--and as a rule--what has been discovered earlier may still be visible, though only as a semblance. ...This covering-up as a 'disguising' is both the most frequent

and the most dangerous, for here the possibilities of deceiving and misleading are especially stubborn.¹⁵

Thus "covering over" shows that Dasein's way-to-be toward being is one of refusal; "covering over" shows or lets be seen how Dasein stands toward being by not standing toward it.¹⁶

We must now return to the problem of distortion in naming things. Such distortion arises because of Dasein's insistence¹⁷ in dominating language. To say naming in this manner distorts, carries with it the presupposition that naming in and of itself does not mean subjugation or mastery of the thing named. What other possibility is there?

There is the possibility that naming is a response. We have said previously, that the way man speaks depends on how he listens; on how attentive he is to what is being said. If listening lets saying be said, then speaking will be a naming which responds. It will not aim at mastery or domination of

15. Being and Time, pg. 60

16. The reason Dasein covers over being and the relationship of covering over to un-truth and the lack of freedom will be taken up further on.

17. See Ft. N. 13, pg. 14 of this chapter.

speech. Here we hesitate, for we encounter a number of perplexing questions: What could speech possibly be apart from Dasein's domination of it? More specifically, could it be at all; could there be speech apart from man's domination of it? What would such speech "look" like; what would be its constitution? Lastly, an unwelcome thought comes to our attention, brought forward by the direction our questions seem to be taking: If man does not bring speech about, "does speech bring man about or into existence"?¹⁸ This question looks very much as though man will not be speaker--but who speaks if man does not? Our questions echo a resistance born of our reluctance to let go of the "prized" hold that our ancestors so tenaciously have bequeathed to us over the eons: the disregard for being.

This "letting go" of the disregard for being means that speech will no longer be closed off to being. Clearly what is required then is nothing less than the restoration of ontology to speech. We must:

18. Poetry, Speech and Thought, pg. 192

...attempt to regain the unimpaired strength of speech* and words; for words and speech are not wrappings in which things are packed for the commerce of those who write and speak. It is in words and speech that things first come into being and are. For this reason the misuse of speech in idle talk, in slogans and phrases, destroys our authentic relation to things.¹⁹

We are contemplating letting things be seen the way they are; but as we think this another question forms itself and brings us up short: If we let things be seen the way they are won't they remind us of our own rootedness in being? Won't we remember our own task? We become apprehensive as we face the last question: Who are we without our mastery and domination?

That man is first a listener bears repeating. Without our mastery we no longer have reason to listen away but now can attend to what is being said. Said? Said how? Does the pen on the table speak or the chair by the wall or the tree against the building? In what way can they be said to speak, we demand. The pen for instance is not merely to write with but it gives itself as pointing to the paper which points to the table which

* See discussion of the substitution of the word "speech" for "language" on pg. 30.

19. Introduction to Metaphysics, pg. 11

points to the floor. The pen gives itself in a network of relationships. The chair is not merely to sit in but is freed²⁰ to refer to the wall, the floor, to me as holding me.

In letting entities be involved so that they are freed for a totality of involvements one must have disclosed already that for which [woraufhin] they have been freed.²¹

The totality of involvements entities are freed for, is the world. The pen and the chair are not merely objects of use nor are they to be taken apart from the context in which they give themselves. What we are attending to then is the givenness of the thing in its totality. Listening, then, lets the thing give itself to be named. It gives itself in a contextual reference as having a world--"beworlde"; as referring to other entities in the world and thereby to the world as a whole. Listening hears the appeal of the thing in its thinghood and responds to that appeal by paying attention to the way the thing is in its referential totality and preserves what it hears for saying. Listening

20. This issue will be taken up in detail in the chapter on authentic communication.

21. Being and Time, pg. 118

listens toward this totality in that it "har-kens" (Horchten)²² i.e., understands its involvement in apprehending the totality of these relationships i.e., the world as bearing upon its own task of having being as an issue for it. The essential nature of the thing as in the world is expressed or said in speech in naming things. "...essence and being express themselves in speech..."²³

What could speech possibly be apart from Dasein's domination of it?" Speech could be itself; speech could say itself. Speech says: it co-re-ponds i.e., it answers in a like manner, in a manner that is appropriate to the appeal that listening has heard. This would imply that speech speaks; that speech says what gives itself to speech; it names the thing in its thinghood and in so doing names what is given.

...Speech speaks by saying, that is by showing. What it says wells up from the formerly spoken and so far still unspoken Saying which pervades the design of speech. Speech speaks in that it, as showing, reaching into all regions of

22. *ibid*, pg. 207

23. Introduction to Metaphysics, pg. 44

presences, summons from them what ever is present
to appear and to fade. We, accordingly, listen
to speech in this way, that we let it say its
Saying to us.²⁴

Such naming names in response to listening. "...naming
calls."²⁵ It summons things forth from their undifferentiated-
ness elevating them from nothing to something, i.e., calls things
into existence out of their formlessness and gives them form.
The form it gives is the word. Summons? Calls? What a strange
manner of speaking. We may understand calling in the sense of
calling to someone to gain or demand their attention, but that
does not seem to help us here. Perhaps raising a question can
clarify the situation. How does naming something, "trees", for
example, call "tree" into the word and what can this possibly
mean? Can we say that naming demands a thing be thus and so?
Surely not, because we would find ourselves returning to mastery.
The thing gives itself to be formed in the word. Naming responds
to this giving. This would imply no insistence. No, we have to
look at calling again.

24. Poetry, Speech and Thought, pg. 124

25. ibid, pg. 198

Suppose naming calls graciously, i.e., bids or invites²⁶ the thing to be what it is in the word. Naming calls the thing near²⁷, into the word so that it can stand out and be what it is--present in its absence. Calling brings the tree near, not by making it physically present at my elbow, but by gathering its essential nature in the word.^{28*} Do we mean to say that in

26. What is Called Thinking, pg. 117

"...And the old word "to call" means not so much command as a letting-reach, that therefore the "call" has an assonance of helpfulness and complaisance, is shown by the fact that the same word in Sanskrit still means something like "to invite".

27. This nearness to which calling calls is not the concern of everyday language because for everyday language "...everything present is equally near and equally far. The distancelessness prevails." (Poetry, Speech and Thought, pg. 177) The near into which things are called by naming, makes room for the thing by letting the thing be seen in its totality. Naming names this totality of relationships and in so doing opens a place for the world through the thinghood of things. "the world grants to things their present. Things bear the world. World grants things." (Poetry, Speech and Thought, pg. 202)

28. On The Way To Speech, pg. 126

* See the discussion of the substitution of the word "speech" for "language" on pg. 30.

"Saying is the gathering which joins all appearance of the in itself manifold showing which everywhere lets all that is shown abide within itself."

naming a thing, the word has the power to bring a thing into being? Exactly so! In On The Way To Speech, Heidegger in speaking of Stephan George's poem, "The Word", points out that "...something is only where the appropriate and therefore competent word names a thing as being."²⁹ The word provides a place for the thing as it is given; the word gives ground to the being of things and "creates" a space for it:

The word's rule springs to light as that which makes the thing be a thing. The word begins to shine as the gathering which brings what presences to its present... The oldest word for the rule of the word thus thought, for Saying is logos: Saying which in showing, lets beings appear in their "it is". ...The same word, however for Saying, is also the word for Being, that is for the presencing of beings. Saying and Being, word and thing, belong to each other in a veiled way... All essential Saying harkens back to this mutual belonging of Saying and Being, word and thing.³⁰

Let us retrace our steps for a moment, as we seem to have passed too hurriedly over the two additional aspects of naming: that of gathering and showing. Naming shows something as what

29. *ibid*, pg. 63

30. *ibid*, pg. 155

it is. Very well, but what does it mean to show? To show means to exhibit something, that is, to let it be seen. What is it that is exhibited in the word? That which makes a tree a tree. The word "tree" shows or exhibits the treeness of tree. What it means to be a tree, i.e., the essential nature of a tree is gathered into a word and shown:

Saying is showing. In everything that speaks to us, in everything that touches us by being spoken about, in everything that gives itself to speaking, or waits for us unspoken, but also in that speaking we do ourselves, there prevails showing which lets* appear what is present,... . Saying is in no way linguistic expression added to the phenomena after they have appeared-- rather, all radiant appearance and all fading away is grounded in the showing saying. Saying sets all present beings free into their given presence and lets (them) disappear into their absence as long as (they) are absent.** Saying

* The substitution of "lets" for "cause" in Hertz's translation correctly returns to the meaning Heidegger intends here. Showing does not cause entities to appear in the sense of cause and effect. Indeed the verb in the German edition of Unterwegs Zur Sprache, Pfulligen, 1959 pg. 257, is "entscheiden lässt", which means to grant permission.

** There is the same problem with the second half of this sentence as well as the additional problem of leaving out the durational aspect of "jeweiliges". Hertz's translation of the sentence reads: "Saying sets all present beings free into their given presence, and brings what is absent into their absence." The German edition is as follows: "Sie befreit Anwesendes in sein jeweiliges Anwesen, entfremdet Abwesendes in sein jeweiliges Abwesen."

pervades and structures the openness of that clearing*** which every appearance must seek out and every disappearance leave behind, and in which every present or absent being must show or announce itself.³¹

But now we seem to have three elements of naming; calling, gathering and showing; we began by looking at only one, calling. Do we have three different things or just one? Does calling gather and show the thing? Is gathering having been called and shown? Is showing what has been called and gathered? Can we give a name to naming that encompasses all three aspects? The answer is yes. The possession of naming is logical. Logos encompasses all three aspects of naming.

The word then, is the "dwelling place" of being; "...speech is the house of being."³² Calling invites the thing to be present³³ in the word, to show itself as it is by laying hold

*** The "clearing" is important to Heidegger's thought and it will be looked at in detail in the third chapter, "Extraordinary Speaking: Authentic Communication".

31. *ibid*, pg. 126

32. *ibid*, pg. 63

33. What Is Called Thinking, pg. 118

"...To call means: to call into arrival and presence; to address commendingly."

of the thing and through keeping it; lets it emerge into truth, [bewahren] in the sense of preserving it in its presentness.

How are we to understand the way the word keeps and preserves the thing in its presentness? Is it understood in the sense that we recall a past definition of the tree and by saying it the word "makes present" by showing "tree" as having been constituted and already given previously? This is not a likely prospect, since the word would, like Nietzsche's "glass coffin"³⁴ entomb the past and there trap the thing closing off its possibility of (its) being presented in its unity. What would be presented is the thing the way it was: the thing as having been. The thing would be closed off from being shown in its referential totality. What would appear is not the thing but the fixedness of the thing--indeed this is what would be shown. The thing would be denied its significance. The word would await the thing and admit or show the thing only partially. If the word is to reveal the thing as it is, time as the horizon of being, will have to be understood another way. That way will have to admit, not a

34. Thus Spake Zarathustra, pg. 246

fragmented thing being as having been, that is, without its potential of appearing any other way, but the thing in its totality: as having been given, as past, as well as open to the future in the present, i.e., not as being confined to a given context. What do we mean by context? What does context have to do with temporality? Tree is not given independently of its being in a forest or by a clearing or on a mountain top. When the temporality of a thing is ignored or forgotten, the givenness of a thing in a new context is also forgotten and its meaning is confined to the past and held captive there. So that a thing may not lose its meaning, what is required is a temporal ecstasis: the thing as having been is, as its "not-yet", here and now.

The givenness gives itself to be called, gathered and shown. What is made present then is the presence of presentness. The un-said is admitted--let in and let be. What is the unsaid that is said? The word grants the thing: "es gibt". To admit something is to send it forth.³⁵ What is sent with the thing is its unity. This unity is "the simple one-fold"³⁶ intimacy of thing

35. Webster's New World Dictionary, pg. 10

36. Poetry, Speech and Thought, pg. 207

and world. It is this intimacy that is the stillness expressed by human speech; stillness bears the unity of being and time. The two, being and time are spoken as one; the appearance and that which appears are gathered and shown:

Speaking speaks as the peal of stillness. Stillness stills by carrying out, the bearing and enduring, of world and things in their presence...

The peal of stillness is not anything human. But on the contrary, the human is indeed in its nature given to speech. The word "speech" as it is here used means having taken place out of the speaking of speech. What has thus taken place, human being, has been brought into its own by speech, so that it remains given over or appropriated to the nature of speaking, the peal of stillness. Such an appropriating takes place in so far as the nature of speaking, the peal of stillness (presencing)* needs** the speaking of

* "...das Geläut der Stille...", appears in the German edition but is replaced by Hofstadter with the word, presencing".

** Discussion of the verb, "needs" ("braucht" in the German edition) must proceed very carefully. Just as it is crucial in the understanding of man's relation to being, it is a most difficult concept and tends to lead our thinking astray. I have also omitted the verb, "uses" which Hofstadter co-joins with "needs" since it does not appear in the German edition and adds little to clarify the understanding of the sentence.

mortals in order to sound as the peal of stillness for the hearing of mortals. Only as men belong within the peal of stillness are mortals able to speak in their own way in sounds.

...What is purely bidden in mortal speech is what is spoken poetically. Poetic speaking is never a higher mode (melos) of everyday speech. It is rather the reverse: everyday speech is a forgotten and used up poetizing, from which there hardly re-sounds a call any longer.³⁷

"Speaking" has been substituted for "language" in this quote (and other places where appropriate also). This substitution brings us to a fundamental criticism of Hofstadter's translation (here we must also include other translators of Heidegger's works who show the same lack of understanding as Hofstadter) of Heidegger's essay, "Die Sprache", from Unterwegs Zur Sprache, which is given the title, "Language". This is not a mere quibble over the substitution of two inter-changeable words based on personal preference; rather, it points to the elusive realization that the basic point Heidegger is making, is precisely that these two words are not interchangeable. The same mistake is made by Hertz in translating several different essays from Unterwegs Zur Sprache. The title should be translated On The Way

37. *ibid*, pg. 207-208

To Speech, since the entire series of lectures collected under that title concerns human speaking and the experience man undergoes with speaking.³⁸ He undergoes no such experience with language. Language is an abstract structure of speaking which is mechanistically oriented; its concern is with the mechanics of speech not speech as discourse which discovers or covers over, shows or hides being. There are languages in which man speaks, e.g., English, German, or French, etc., but in whatever language he speaks, it is his speaking, not the language spoken which is the ground for his relatedness to being. It is for these reasons that the substitution has been made where appropriate.

This passage exhibits another flaw in Hofstadter's translation. The German edition reads as follows: "Das rein Geheissene des sterblichen Sprechens ist das Gesprochene des Gedichtes.". Hofstadter translates this as: "What is purely bidden in mortal speech is spoken in the poem." This translation loses sight of the difference between "extra-ordinary" speaking and "everyday"

38. On The Way To Speech, pg. 57.

speaking. It is not that we must go about speaking in meter and rhyme as Hofstadter's translation indicates but that "poetic speaking", [Gedichte] clears the way or dis-covers being. The same is true of "poetizing" or [Gedicht] in the last sentence of this paragraph where Hofstadter has "...everyday speech is a forgotten and used up poem." The German edition has: "Vielmehr vernutztes Gedicht...".

We must now break our discussion off here and take up the question which we so far have left unanswered: "If man does not bring speaking about, does 'speaking bring man about or into existence?'" The answer is yes; neither can be without the other. Man needs speech, but at the same time speech needs man:

...Speech needs human speaking, and yet it is not merely of the making or the command of our speech activity...³⁹

Dasein can either forget, in which case speech "make(s) present" or confines entities to being as having been (here Dasein takes revenge against time and "it was" and closes itself off from future possibilities); or Dasein can remember, letting speech

39. On The Way To Speech, pg. 125

speak, that is, show entities in their referential totality. Entities give themselves, that is, address man; they can appear, but the referential totality is significant only for Dasein. Such a task is Dasein's alone.

What has been presented in this chapter is an overview of the nature of communication as it arises from its ontological roots. We have deliberately refrained from beginning with an assumed definition of communication. We have dealt mainly with entities which address Dasein with the important exception of entities which are themselves Dasein (except quite generally). We have intentionally withheld from view, and find missing, man as speaker; for he has been limited to the important role of listener. We must now turn to Dasein as speaker; for not only is Dasein in the world with other entities (Mit-sein) but it must de-cide⁴⁰ how or the way it will be in the world with them. Certain structures are:

40. See Ft. N. 1 on page 1 of the Introduction.

...equiprimordial with being in the world: being-with and Dasein-with [Mit-sein und Mitdasein]. In this kind of being is grounded the mode of everyday being-one's Self [Selbstsein]; the explication of this mode will enable us to see what we may call the 'subject' of everydayness--the "one"*.41

-
- * "One" has been substituted for "they" because it doesn't make sense to say, "I am they". There is precedence for using "one" however in both the French and German language: "on croit" and "man glaubt". The English use of "one" is also acceptable. While Macquarrie & Robinson discuss this in detail on pg. 149 of Being and Time, they decide to use "they" in place of "one". I will use "Das Man" and leave it untranslated or "one".

41. Being and Time, pg. 149-150

Chapter II

Ordinary Speaking: The In-Authentic Mode of Communication

Even to cite speaking as "ordinary" at all implies a contrast; that there is another kind of speaking that is different. It also implies that some distance has been gained from Dasein's immersion in such speaking and that Dasein is capable of a growing awareness that can understand ordinary speaking for what it is. Wisdom for Plato was seeing the shadow as shadow. There is no doubt that it is a long and arduous journey from out of the darkened cave into the sunlight.¹ It is an equally difficult journey for Dasein to gain distance from everyday speaking since its immersion in this speaking leaves little room for thought or critical perspective. From within this mode of speaking, in which Dasein lives out its life for the most part, everything is tranquil. Speech is already established and all Dasein need do is go along; this it does functioning quite well within ordinary speech until it becomes aware of another possibility, i.e., extraordinary speaking; until it faces its finitude through anxiety and the call to conscience.

1. The Republic, Book VIII

In uncovering the structure of Dasein's awareness of this speaking as ordinary, we might impose three constituent aspects as an arbitrary means of bringing this growth to light. Therefore this chapter will emphasize the various degrees of awareness in each aspect through which Dasein gradually moves; due to its thrownness, it becomes dispersed in publicness to the degree it fails to hear or allow the ontological realm to make itself manifest. Dasein is first caught up in everyday speaking and can say little if anything about it, for Dasein has no point from which to take a stand. This does not mean, however, that this dispersal is or can ever be total, leaving Dasein in the dark, completely cut off from the possibility of gaining some distance from it. It can gain this distance to the degree that it is not distracted by entities in the world. Secondly, the lessening of this fascination with entities if brought about through anxiety* which although in the background of ordinary speaking, makes it possible for Dasein to gain distance from everyday speaking, as it

* In order to avoid a misunderstanding, it seems appropriate to remind the reader that "...anxiety...belongs to existence as such and not to an abnormal state of mind as in neurotic (and psychotic) anxiety... ." The Courage To Be, pg. 41.

brings Dasein face to face with its finitude. Finally, the dissatisfaction Dasein experiences due to anxiety brings it to a turning point, a cross-road where it faces two possibilities: it can either flee being toward death by fleeing toward the world and absorbing itself in the world even more deeply than before to avoid its nothingness or--it can relate authentically to its mortality. Anxiety affords Dasein the possibility of obtaining a standpoint and allows it to recognize in-authentic speaking for what it is and only then will Dasein be able to turn its attention to an alternative mode of communication.

In inquiring into the way these aspects are manifested in Dasein's ordinary speaking, we must come to grips with the following questions: Just what is our ordinary way of listening and speaking? Who is the listener or speaker? What does such speaking speak about? Who is spoken to? Is this speaking in any way deficient? If so, how and why? What is Heidegger's alternative?

That speaking which Dasein engages in from day to day is called "ordinary" or "everyday" speaking. Neither of these terms is to be taken in a pejorative sense, that is, they do not imply

that Dasein has "less being or a lower degree of being"² when speaking in this mode. These terms do mean that when we ask, "How do we find Dasein's speaking of speech 'proximally and for the most part'?", we mean to do nothing other than to inquire into the way Dasein manifests itself "usually but not always" as being in the world with other beings [Mit-Sein] in a public manner.³

It is in this public manner, that Dasein comes 'face to face' with the possibility of its being [Mit-Dasein] in its everyday inter-human relationships. Dasein finds itself an entity amid the other Daseins it wanders among, becoming fascinated by its ability to manipulate and use them. In its wanderings, it becomes lost in its effort to satisfy its desires which are given it by "Das Man",* It turns first to this entity

2. Being and Time, pg. 68

3. ibid, pg. 42

"What we have in mind in the expression of "everydayness" is a definite "how" of existence by which Dasein is dominated through and through for life. ... 'Proximally' signifies the way in which Dasein shows itself for Everyman, not always, 'but as a rule'".

* "Das Man" and "One" are the same. See * Chapter 1, pg. 34.

for satisfaction and then to another, exhausting each in turn superficially, looking for that which will give meaning to its life. Dasein seldom thinks to question or extend its search to that which grounds these entities: Being. As long as it mistakes the ontic level for the whole of reality, it will continue to be frustrated in its search.

Most of the time it is content to drift along on the ontic level on which in functions in its day to day living:

...Everydayness is determinative for Dasein even when it has not chosen "Das Man" for its hero... .
Everydayness is a way to be--...to which of course, that which is publically manifest belongs.⁴

Because of the tranquillity* it feels on this level it forgets or ignores an alternative level on which its ontological task lies.

4. ibid, pg. 422

* Tranquillization comes about "...when Dasein, tranquillized and 'understanding' everything, thus compares itself with everything, it drifts toward an alienation in which...(its ontological task is hidden from it). Dispersed Being-in-the-world is not only tempting and tranquillizing; it is at the same time alienating". ("Dispersed" is substituted for "Falling" [Verfallen] because it is less subject to misunderstanding and is also more accurately descriptive of Dasein's state of being lost in publicness.) (ibid, pg. 222).

Dasein by-passes the ontological level by saying, "It will not put bread on the table, build bridges or pay the mortgage".⁵

Dasein immerses itself in the world of busyness, the world of production and technology in which it loses itself to the values that have been imposed upon it as "One" of many. Paradoxically, Dasein claims or insists that this publicness is the whole of reality.

In mistaking part of reality for its whole, Dasein makes three subsequent errors: When it is asked, "Who listens or speaks"?, it says, "I do", in the erroneous assumption that the "I" who answers, the "I who is One among many" is myself, the autonomous or individual Self [Selbständig] of Dasein's

5. Heidegger-Through Phenomenology to Thought.

"The phenomenological analysis of everydayness is not concerned, of course, with describing how a man uses his knife and fork but how underneath all commerce, There-being and other beings, there lies the coming to pass of transcendence." Transcendence means here passing from being Mit-Sein to being Mit-Dasein, i.e., the primacy of Dasein over other entities is that among all entities it alone has its very being as its task. (pg. 35-36)

being, when in fact it is not myself, the "not-I"⁶, the ["Un-selbständigkeit"] that listens or speaks instead. The concern of everyday listening or speaking is "idle talk, gossip and hear-say"*, which it mistakes in all seriousness as its proper interest. Those to whom Dasein speaks are notably absent as other Selves, for Dasein directs its speaking to everyone and no one in particular. It listens to and speaks with others who are but many inter-changeable "ones". Thus it

6. Being and Time, pg. 152

"The word 'I' is to be understood only in the sense of a non-committal formal indicator, indicating something which may perhaps reveal itself as its 'opposite' in some particular phenomenal context of being. In that case, the 'not-I' is by no means tantamount to an entity which essentially lacks 'I-hood' "Ichheit", but is rather a definite kind of being which the 'I' itself possesses, such as having lost itself [Selbstverlorenheit]".

- * "...mere hearing scatters and defuses itself in what is commonly believed and said, in hearsay, in doxa, appearance. ...The man who is not a follower (Parmenides refers here to authentic listening in which the "collectedness of the essent itself is followed) is excluded from the logos from the start. Those who merely hear by listening around and assembling rumors remain the [axynetoi], the uncomprehending. ..." (Introduction to Metaphysics, pg. 109.)

is, that in ordinary listening and speaking, Dasein almost always passes by the possibility for becoming itself.

Dasein clings to the ontic level by concealing that of the ontological level. The everyday speaking in which Dasein manifests itself temporally is in un-truth which it takes to be its truth. It seems to the "One" that truth belongs to man rather than being. Dasein's insistence that entities be up-rooted from their ontological ground in the publicness of speaking does not do away with that ground, i.e., the ground is always given with the entity whether Dasein apprehends this entity in its totality or not. That this ground is given makes it possible for Dasein to apprehend an entity ontically; it provides a network of meaning from which the entity can be abstracted. To be more specific: in its everyday speaking, Dasein pays attention or listens to what is said as such. What is shown or pointed out in this speaking (and in every ordinary speaking for that matter), is being toward an entity in a manner that reveals it only partially. What is not shown is being toward an entity in its totality; it is this that is covered over, heard out of context. This in turn leads to a response that also disregards

the context; what is spoken about, e.g., the tree, the rock, or the person, is being spoken about as already established; it is confined to being as having been and is thus cut off from future possibilities to preserve it temporally.* From listening to speaking then, ordinary speech orients itself in the past which it also takes to be its future and which it makes present in a series of on-going "nows", revealing Dasein as temporally confined to the past in a fixed manner. Due to the way Dasein temporalizes itself through its mis-relation to the three aspects of time, Dasein stretches itself along a linear plane dis-regarding the ecstatic temporality in favor of one aspect of it, and, being in un-truth, it is therefore un-free.

This overview affords us a look at the general structure of everyday speaking, but it has not revealed a clear picture of the growth of Dasein's awareness. We should turn now to look at everyday listening and speaking in detail, so that this growth can be followed as Dasein variously experiences it

* While this preservation lends continuity to speech and thought, the main purpose here is Dasein's attempt to keep things as they were "making present" its past in an infinite series of "nows" in a bid for immortality; it is an attempted denial of finitude. This will become more clear by the end of this chapter.

in its three constituent aspects, coming to grips with the limitations along its way toward taking up its task--the meaning of its existence.

Our ordinary way of listening and speaking is a public one⁷--it is the world of "Das Man". Dasein as "Das Man" has its initial sense of self given to it by everyone, but this fact goes unrecognized until Dasein gradually becomes aware of itself as "One" as it comes up against the limits of ordinary speech and can see this speech for what it is. Dasein finds itself thrown into an already existent way of speaking in which words flow forth in the service of convention. Conventional listening and speaking, listening and speaking in our usual manner which includes the usual content and form, is what we mean 'proximally and for the most part' by communication. From the time we begin speaking as young children, "Das Man" has already taken over; at the first manifestations of crying out as a baby to the last breath of old age, we are given to understand there is an appropriate way to think and feel. These thoughts and feelings must conform to those of "One". This conformity, nameless and

7. *ibid*, pg. 165

faceless as it is, imposes itself throughout its very existence. This imposition is never sudden nor in the open where Dasein can confront it, rather it lies hidden from sight. "One" says or does this or that in a traditional way but if Dasein were to ask "who" is the "One" who decrees thus and so, there would be no answer because it is no-one in particular.

The dictatorship of "Das Man" begins in the way Dasein listens. The way Dasein listens determines the degree it will become immersed in everydayness; to the degree that listening refuses to admit and restore the ontological ground of speaking to speech, for example, if it hears only faintly, the more deeply Dasein becomes fascinated by and absorbed in the world. On the other hand, the more willingly Dasein gives up its insistence in denying this significant totality by listening more attentively, the more distinctly it will hear "the call of conscience"⁸ and the less the world of One will hold sway over it.

8. The foundation has not been laid for introducing this term but it is too early yet to make such an introduction although its use is appropriate here. It is discussed later in this chapter on page 65 and in detail in the next chapter beginning on page 86.

That "Das Man" 'understands' the importance of listening should come as little surprise, since it has made a mode of listening the concern of publicness, much to the delight of businesses which find it both a marketable product (books, articles, and educational programming) as well as a useful tool (management personnel are given courses to learn how to "listen" to their workers, concentrating on picking up key words which can be used to persuade the worker himself that he is really cared about). Learning how to listen has come to be recognized as a major problem in everyday communication. Bookstore shelves display the latest "bestsellers" which are willing to unlock the secrets of communication for the price of the book. Magazines publish article after article about children whose parents won't listen to them; about parents who accuse their off-spring of "tuning them out and turning them off"; and about husbands and wives whose marriages end in divorce, giving the reason as incompatibility--a polite euphemism many times for the failure to listen to one-another. What happens then in our everyday listening that brings about this frustrating state of affairs?

"Das Man's" concern with listening and its proposed remedies are of little avail since the problem arises in the first place because Dasein listens as "One" listens; it listens, in passing, to what is said. This listening is characterized by listening in an average way that maintains itself in an attitude of indifference. Dasein hears what it has always heard just as it has always heard it, even if what Dasein hears appears new to it; it still listens in the same way that abstracts the entity talked about from its referential totality.

Inauthentic listening is characterized by a distorted temporal ecstasis which regulates itself according to an infinite series of 'nows' by retaining what it hears as having been heard. What of the future? There too listening imposes its past on the "not yet" by pushing it ahead of itself so that the "not-yet-now" is, as having been. Nietzsche so aptly characterized this temporal ecstasis as man's "...ill will against time and its 'it was'".⁹ Listening mis-relates to all three aspects of the

9. Thus Spake Zarathustra, pg. 252.

moment: The past is fixed, the present is an infinite series of "nows" continuing the fixedness of the past. The future is in reality denied since it is sealed off from the possibility of a new context.* Openness toward the future which comes toward Dasein is obscured. All that is heard is the entity abstracted from the ground and passed along. The network of meaning in which entities refer to one another is ignored. The foundation for listening then is a reliance on the past in which:

inauthentic understanding temporalizes itself
as an awaiting which makes present [gegenwärtigendes
Gewärtigen] --an awaiting to whose ecstatical
unity there must belong a corresponding 'having
been'.¹⁰

Dasein assumes that what it hears will be as it always was and so it picks up a word or phrase here and there, but in spite of the "attention" it pays, it still maintains a disinterested

* The subject of inauthentic temporality is by no means dealt with in a complete manner, yet to do so here would place us ahead of ourselves without a firm foundation to build upon as we have not introduced the possibility of anxiety or the way being towards death shapes our flight toward infinity through our ordinary understanding of 'time'.

10. Being & Time, pg. 388.

attitude. It is not a matter of WHAT is said, for all content of everyday speaking is heard in the same manner; nor does it matter that this "One" speaks rather than that "One". We hear what we are expected to hear and in the way that is appropriate to "One". Dasein hears what "One" says and responds in its speaking by way of speculating and passing along what it has heard. The obligation Dasein might have to understand, to seek the truth, is dispensed with. Dasein is released from the responsibility of making what is said its own, because in listening it has only heard what "One" hears as "One" hears. It need not think through, consider or reflect--all that is required is a kind of mindless acceptance of what is decreed by "Das Man".

The mindless acceptance that characterizes listening, makes itself manifest in Dasein's speaking with one another as "Idle talk":

.....Idle talk is the possibility of understanding everything without previously making the thing one's own.¹¹

11. Being and Time, pg. 213

Dasein hears and understands what is said in "idle talk" only "approximately and superficially. We have the same things in view because it is in the same averageness that we have a common understanding of what is said."¹² In "idle talk" we abstract from the given situation so that words reveal what has been the case in similar situations; we "level" all situations into being as that one once was. Our greetings, endearments, questions and assertions are said as "One" would say them. Their significance is measured in its measurelessness; that is, in confining these entities to their past, to being as having been, Dasein relates to them repetitiously. Everything is equally important and equally un-important. In its habitual understanding of entities, Dasein says, "It's raining today.", "How are you?", "I love you"., valuing the content of speech indiscriminately; in such speaking, all content is interchangeable and distanceless.

It is because there is no particular "One" to be singled out in the anonymity of publicness that Dasein feels helpless and is at the disposal of "Das Man". Yet it is Dasein's going along with this publicness and covering over its going

12. *ibid*, pg. 212

along that makes "Das Man" all the more powerful. It seems strange that Dasein belongs to "Das Man" both in its ("Das Man's") imposition and in Dasein's going along yet Dasein does not realize its own involvement.

This lack of awareness on Dasein's part will seem more plausible if we understand the three reasons that hide and distort Dasein's perspective: First, the listener or speaker is no particular "One", but rather, it is "One" of many; Second, the content of Dasein's listening and speaking, that about which it listens and speaks, is given to it by "Das Man"; and last, those to whom it speaks are like itself, part of the anonymous crowd:

'The Others' whom one thus designates in order to cover up the fact of one's belonging to them essentially oneself... 'are there' in everyday being with one-another. The 'who' is not this one, not that one, not oneself [man selbst], not some people [einige] and not the sum of them all. ...¹³

Still, there is the danger that our speaking thus reduces "Das Man" to an abstract entity--something vaporous. It must

13. *ibid*, pg. 164

be made perfectly clear that in his everydayness, Dasein is "Das Man": one-self [Das Man-Selbst]; that is, Dasein is given to itself in terms of being an impersonal "One". This understanding extends to the way it 'sees' itself as subject:

Proximally, it is not 'I', in the sense of my own Self that 'am' but rather the Others, whose way is that of "Das Man". In terms of the "One" and as the "One", I am 'given' proximally, Dasein is "One", and for the most part remains so.¹⁴

Dasein understands itself as and is closest to the "Self" given to it by "Das Man". Dasein disperses itself among its myriad of ways to be and is "driven about by them" because of its absorption in the world. Due to this fragmentation, Dasein covers over the question of being itself and 'lives up' to its various ways to be as "One":

Dasein's facticity is such that its being-in-the-world has always dispersed [zerstreut] itself or even split itself up into definite ways of being in. The multiplicity of these is indicated by the following examples: having to do with something, producing something, attending to something, giving something up and letting it go, undertaking, accomplishing, evincing,

14. *ibid*, pg. 167

interrogating, considering, discussing, determining...
 All these ways of being-in have concern* as their
 kind of being...¹⁵

Dasein encounters the world as 'present at hand'; so too, it attempts to understand itself the same way,¹⁶ it understands its "not-I" as its "I" and holds on to this understanding tenaciously. It tries to make itself into a thing but it can NEVER totally succeed because there is always the possibility of recovery, that is, Dasein can at any point retrieve itself from this dispersal in the world. This attempt to understand itself as 'present at

* The German word, "'Besorgen' stands rather for the kind of 'concern' in which we 'concern ourselves' with activities which we perform or things we procure." (Being and Time, pg. 83, Ft.N. 1.) It is "the kind of dealing which is closest to us...not a bare perceptual cognition, but rather that kind of concern which manipulates things and puts them to use;..."

15. *ibid*, pg. 83

16. *ibid*, pg.68

"...Dasein does not have the kind of being which belongs to something present at hand within the world, nor does it ever have it." Understanding itself thus is a mistake on Dasein's part. The reason for this manner of going astray will be taken up in the Conclusion.

hand' is the result of Dasein's flight in the face of the possibility of its Self-realization, that is, it flees the realization that it will no longer be; that its being is being towards death. It endeavors to achieve its endurance through the on-going conventional and traditional "self" supplied by Others. It therefore fosters this vacuousness by allowing itself to be determined by everyone; what Dasein says is decided by what Others will think of it--how they will judge it. Its thoughts and feelings are regulated in an acceptable manner to please everyone but it thinks it is pleasing its Self. Dasein takes itself as it finds itself, but moreover, it takes this part to be the whole--and so "it misses itself and covers itself up".¹⁷

Dasein asks the questions that "Das Man" asks; makes assertions and interpretations that "One" makes. There is nothing to distinguish the listening or speaking of this Dasein from that of any other Dasein; for Dasein becomes more and more anonymous--lost in the "One" as it flees choosing its Self:

17. *ibid*, pg. 168

This being with one another dissolves one's own Dasein completely into the kind of being of 'the Others', in such a way, indeed that the Others as distinguishable and explicit, vanish more and more. In this inconspicuousness and unascertainability, the real dictatorship of the "One" is unfolded.¹⁸

The dissolution of Dasein into "Das Man" begins as speech is learned and makes in-roads as socialization is pressed upon it. Values are assigned and any deviation from the norm brings quick censure, while acceptance of such an imposition brings public acclaim. Nowhere is this more strikingly noted than in the Platonic Dialogue, "The Apology", in which Socrates, in questioning the accepted meaning of speech agreed upon by a consensus of public opinion, shows the conceit* of everyday speaking, thus bringing public disapproval to bear on his activities. Afraid of losing its hold on Dasein by having its complacency disturbed, "Das Man" goes

18. *ibid*, pg. 164

* The "conceit" referred to in this dialogue is the hubris of public opinion in its claim that human wisdom is unlimited; that it is the whole of reality rather than a part. In everyday speaking this un-deserved claim to truth is insisted on by "Everyman". See 22d & e and 23 e., Collected Dialogues, Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns.

to great lengths to maintain its position. The lengths it goes to are in direct proportion to the threat it feels; for Socrates, the choice offered was cessation of questioning, exile or death.

Even where rebellion from the standards decreed by publicness (here we are not including Socrates) exists, it does so 'for the most part' in a public manner, i.e., if one must "swim against the tide", the ways disapproval can be expressed are also dictated by "Das Man". What perhaps began as an original questioning of publicness runs the risk of being popularized, of being taken over by "Das Man" and rendered harmless by being made a "fad", a socially acceptable game to be indulged in but not taken seriously except as "One" is serious.

The cry against the dehumanization of technocracy, and the need to re-think priorities in our everyday dealings with one-another, as exemplified by the "Flower Children" of the 1960's, were instances of this process. These movements soon became meaningless as publicness countered the threat to its authority by making them "the thing to do" and by reducing attempted "original" speaking to jargon and slogans. It then turned these slogans against the spirit of such speaking in a mocking manner without any attempt to listen or uncover the truth in such speaking; e.g., the fact that

"flower power" and "spaceship earth" were efforts to recall us to an open caring for each other and our environment, were laughed at; while "getting it together" (pointing toward a bid for individuation) and "different strokes for different folks" (pointing toward acceptance of differences between individuals) were seen to be anarchy.

In order to hinder, discourage or stop potential "original" speech and preserve Dasein as "One", "Das Man" banalizes such speaking by making it familiar and drawing it into everyday speech, speeding its degeneration. There, in everyday speech, "original" speech is dispersed until this speaking becomes common; some activity to be taken up in the manner one takes up this or that and becomes immersed in it. For example, "flower power" is publicized by setting it to a catchy jingle and using it to improve the florist business or sell fertilizer for plants. Such publicizing need not be so blatant, however, since politics, business and religion--or just "getting ahead" can concern "one" in the same way.

Dasein's reluctance to disturb conventional speech, emotions and thoughts, i.e., to resist the dictatorship of the many by risking the comfortable anonymity that being lost in publicness affords, is due to the difficulty of reaching past the "self" given to it by

"Das Man". Having been soothed by the assurances of everyone that its familiarity with entities in idle talk is evidence that it understands everything about the world and itself, Dasein can easily believe there is no need to question that publicness can provide it with the meaning of existence.

In this placid state, Dasein floats unattached in its speaking, repeating what "one" has heard without question. Engaging in the mindless babble of everyday speaking that "measures out life with coffee spoons", by concerning itself with superficial questions such as: "Shall I part my hair behind? Do I dare to eat a peach?"¹⁹, Dasein is alienated from "...its ownmost potentiality for being..."²⁰ Dasein exhibits this alienation (although it is for the most part unaware of it as such) in the following examples of estrangement in ordinary speaking: by referring to itself in the third person as one; "One is forced to do these things.", "One says or does thus and so"; in the first person plural, Dasein attempts to shed its identity as its "own" in "We are all only human", or in refusing responsibility, Dasein uses the neuter--"It couldn't be helped."

19. T.S. Eliot, The Complete Poems and Plays, from "The Love Song of J. Alfred Profrock", pg. 7.

20. Being and Time, pg. 232

This lack of appropriation in Dasein's everyday speaking, in the sense of "failing" to make my own, is hidden from view due to the tranquillity fostered by publicness. At the same time, this tranquillity is undercut by a vague un-easiness which Dasein can't single out, but which is there none the less, when the emptiness of its speaking becomes fleetingly apparent. It is supposed to understand itself according to what it has been led to believe by Others, after all it has been made quite clear that every "one" has this understanding; yet Dasein is not at all sure just what it understands, just what its relation to its world is in its speaking. It is assailed by the nagging possibility that perhaps it has been led astray in its speaking in going along with "Das Man's" imposition, although this realization may be only an indefinite suspicion.

What then is to bring Dasein to the point where it can free itself to some degree from its dispersal in everyday speaking where it can understand itself and its world? "Das Man" cannot take Dasein over completely, nor at the same time can Dasein "go along" in such a manner as to be entirely lost in the publicness of idle talk, because it can never fully dis-own itself. If it were possible for Dasein to immerse itself in the world completely, it would be without possibility--it would be determined and unfree, totally in

the dark. How can Dasein be brought out of the partial darkness and into the light? In terms of the three constituent aspects already arbitrarily distinguished, how can Dasein achieve its growth through the aspect of its preoccupation with entities in everyday speaking to encompass that aspect which can be characterized as a diminishing involvement with others brought about by anxiety? How is it to free itself to some degree of the imposition of "Das Man" and choose itself, thus becoming individualized? In other words, how is Dasein to appropriate or reach as its own its "unique openness to being"²¹.

Dasein believes it could understand itself in terms of its world and being with others, but anxiety deprives it of its "at-homeness" in the dispersal of the publicness of everyday speaking by disclosing the world as world, thus disrupting Dasein's complacency. The grip Dasein seems to have on the "fixedness" of the past made present, (for example: the use of the qualifying terms in its speaking such as "continually", "ever", "forever", and "always"), seems to crumble before it as Dasein is called upon to cast its decision to be its Self in its speaking. The anxiety Dasein feels in various

21. Heidegger and The Path Of Thinking, from the essay, "On The Way To Being", pg. 13.

situations* which involve the meaning of its life, such as a new job, marriage, puberty, old age; those situations in which Dasein is thrown back upon its Self and is faced with the question, "Who am I?", in any of its various forms, lessen Dasein's preoccupation with entities. New situations supply a context in which the old formulations of speaking aren't adequate. The discomfort brought on by this inadequacy leads Dasein to cover over the newness of a situation by dealing with it in terms of an old way of responding. One way of doing this is in terms of stereotypes of inauthentic speaking which down-grades life, e.g., referring to government as

* "...Immediately seen, anxiety is the painful feeling of not being able to deal with the threat of a special situation. But a more exact analysis shows that in the anxiety about any special situation anxiety about the human situation as such is implied. It is the anxiety of not being able to preserve one's own being which underlies every fear and is the frightening element in it. In the moment, therefore, in which "naked anxiety" lays hold of the mind, the previous objects of fear cease to be definite objects. They appear as what they always were in part, symptoms of man's basic anxiety. As such they are beyond the reach of even the most courageous attack upon them. ...The basic anxiety, the anxiety of a finite being about the threat of non-being, cannot be eliminated. It belongs to existence itself. ..." (The Courage To Be, pg. 38)

the "establishment"; marriage, as "the ball and chain gang"; the young, as "the Pepsi generation" and the elderly, as the "over the hill gang":

...Anxiety thus takes away from Dasein the possibility of understanding itself as it disperses in terms of the world and the way things have been publically interpreted. Anxiety throws Dasein back on that which it is anxious about--its authentic potentiality for being in the world. Anxiety individualizes Dasein for its ownmost being-in-the-world, which as something that understands, projects itself essentially upon possibilities. Therefore... anxiety discloses Dasein as being-possible. ...²²

As Dasein rushes from this to that, entangled in its ontic projects, its frenzy of activity cannot completely hide the uncanniness that pursues it even in the midst of the tranquillity of everyday speaking. Even in those moments when it is certain of its mastery over the world, when it is content and happy, Dasein is still assailed by uneasiness. It is not this or that entity that makes Dasein uneasy; it does not turn away from entities within the world, on the contrary, it flees toward them; but in so doing, it flees its own being in the world. Dasein surrounds itself with the continuous chatter of radio or television because it is uncomfortable with solitude and has need of noise to distract itself--to pull its

22. Being and Time, pg. 232

attention away from serious consideration of where it is coming from and where it is going. Dasein's flight discloses the "there" from which it flees as flight from its authentic possibilities; it turns away from becoming its Self, and flees its thrownness, its being-in-the-world. More specifically, Dasein flees its thrownness toward death.

Just as the designation of one mode of speaking as "everyday" implied it to be contrasted with another kind of speaking as extra-ordinary, so too the comfort Dasein feels in being "one" of many in everyday speaking implies discomfort or the feeling of not being at home (uncanny) as an authentic potentiality for being its Self:

...When in dispersal we flee into the "at-home" of publicness, we flee in the face of the "not-at-home"; that is, we flee in the face of the uncanniness which lies in Dasein--in Dasein as thrown being-in-the-world, which has been delivered over to itself in its being. This uncanniness pursues Dasein constantly, and is a threat to its everyday lostness in the "One", though not explicitly. This threat can go together factically with complete assurance and self-sufficiency in one's everyday concern.²³

23. *ibid*, pg. 234

Although anxiety is a "constant...threat..." to Dasein's dispersal in the publicness of everyday speaking, it is not an obvious one. Because anxiety remains in the background of ordinary speaking for the most part, moving to the foreground only rarely, "...It (anxiety) is to be understood as an extreme possibility ("äusserste Möglichkeit) and as such cannot be necessary (nicht notwendig)." ²⁴ "One" dismisses anxiety and mistakenly concludes therefore that it itself is not anxious:

And only because anxiety is always latent (rather than manifest) in being-in-the-world, can such being-in-the-world, ever be afraid. Fear is anxiety, dispersed into the 'world', inauthentic, and as such hidden from itself.

After all, the mood of uncanniness remains, factically, something for which we mostly have no existentiell understanding. Moreover, under the ascendancy of dispersal and publicness, 'real' anxiety is rare. ...²⁵

It is not clear to Dasein that the uneasiness it feels in crisis situations (be they happy occasions where "one" is reluctant to look too hard at its happiness and says, "Don't tempt fate! It (happiness) won't last.", or on sad occasions says, "That's life!"),

24. Heidegger and The Path To Thinking, from the essay, "On The Way To Being", pg. 13

25. Being and Time, pg. 234

which throw it against its own resources, is at its base an ontological one. Dasein is constantly "called"²⁶ to take up its task, that is, it is invited into the "openness" of being. This vague uneasiness is "nothing" Dasein can "put its finger on" by clearly singling out what oppresses it. What oppresses it is the fact that it has forgotten the wholeness that is appropriate to it. Those who claim they are not anxious often cover over their anxiety by not attending to it. To the degree that Dasein turns toward or is open to being; to the degree that it willingly listens, the more it readily confronts its anxiety, trying to take hold of it, the more clearly anxiety assumes a central role of concern. Yet Dasein can never leave dispersal in everyday speaking behind completely--so anxiety can never be perfectly and completely grasped by Dasein no matter how willingly or attentively it listens. The more inauthentically Dasein listens, the less willing it is to come to terms with anxiety, the less it is AWARE that it is anxious, because it covers over the ontological roots of anxiety and attributes any

26. "...It (conscience) is a call to the discovery, by a Self that is thrown into the world, of its own real possibilities in their death-directed reality. Conscience is the silence of my being before the call of its own situation. The Meaning of Heidegger, pg. 35.

anxiety however vague to this or that in the situation. Dasein rarely grasps the ontological implications of anxiety because it forgets the ontological dimension by closing itself off from it as it attempts to flee its mortality.

The role of anxiety is to bring Dasein to the turning point where it must decide the way it will temporally relate to its being toward death. Dasein must come to grips with its nothingness in answer to the "call of conscience", i.e., awareness by Dasein itself that it is "An Ek-sistent whose possibilities begin in the darkness of the Geworfenheit ("thrownness") and end in the certitude of death, can never in its Da be far from a realization of its nothingness (Nichtigkeit)."²⁷ Dasein can either cover over its being toward death by flight into dispersal or it can relate to death authentically as its ownmost possibility. The discussion of the third of the constituent aspects of the growth of Dasein's awareness will center on the way Dasein's inauthentic relation to death is manifested in everyday speaking; but at the same time, comment on an alternative mode of speaking, extra-ordinary speaking, which relates to death as its own possibility, will be reserved for the next chapter.

27. The Meaning of Heidegger, pg. 35

As anxiety frees Dasein to some degree from its fascination with entities within the world, it also loosens the way Dasein manifests itself temporally as its awareness of itself, as being toward death, takes hold. When Dasein inauthentically grasps death as a final point at which projection into the future must be abandoned, the point at which possibilities cease, death becomes that possibility which is to be eluded as its "ownmost" possibility. To this end, Dasein's ordinary response is the attempt to flee the realization of death as its own by dispersing itself in everyday speaking. This dispersal allows Dasein to impersonalize its response to death as its own and relate to its mortality in the manner of "One".

Just as it was pointed out above that "Das Man" dictated the ways disapproval of the standards of publicness could be expressed, so here too, "Das Man" regulates the manner in which Dasein as "One" is to behave toward death. In public talk, death is separated from life as an unfortunate event which befalls others but has little to do with Dasein in its day to day living. "When my time comes...", Dasein says, rushing to turn aside any contemplation of death as a possibility at all, but treats it rather as something actual at some unknown point--certainly not something to be contended with at the moment since "One" concentrates on life and "One's" involvement with

it. Taking death as being at an end, Dasein, in its horror at contemplating what it takes to be the event of its nothingness, can go to ridiculous lengths to hide its anxiety over death. Goethe, for instance

...refused to hear of the death of friends and hid himself from the view of passing funeral processions. In addition, he forbade mention of death in his presence and tried to cut death out of his existence.²⁸

Another way inauthentic Dasein expresses its latent anxiety is through "black" humor (humor about death or dying in which the tragic is made fun of to mask the pain Dasein feels) which makes light of any seriousness with which Dasein might approach death in an attempt to relieve the sharpness of the anguish it feels over its finitude with such expressions that refer to death as "Kicking the bucket", or "Pushing up the daisies".

Publicness attempts to cover over or make light of Dasein's thrownness by reassuring it (Dasein) that it is morbid to pay the slightest attention to death* except as "One" dies, but paradoxically, "One" does not die; "One" passes on, sleeps, or is at rest. An

28. Living Your Dying, pg. 5

* For example, it is considered a distasteful breach of convention to make death the topic of conversation at a cocktail party or in casual talking.

elaborate "cosmetology" industry which is an off-shoot of the mortuary business, has as its task, the problem of making corpses look like they are not dead at all, but asleep, and that any second they will wake, sit up and climb out of the casket to join the mourners. Not only is death hidden beneath the artifices of make-up, but the ravages of life as well are glossed over; Dasein tries to deny the change over from one kind of being to another; "from an entity with Dasein's kind of being to no-longer Dasein".²⁹ In this manner, "Das Man" hopes to soothe and tranquillize Dasein's uneasiness about death so that it will forget that death is 'non-relational and not to be outstripped':*

This evasive concealment in the face of death dominates everydayness so stubbornly that, in being with one another, the 'neighbors' often still keep talking the 'dying person' into the belief that he will escape death and soon return to the tranquillized everydayness of the world of his concern. Such 'solicitude' is meant to console him. It insists on bringing him back into Dasein, while in addition it helps him to

29. Being and Time, pg. 281

* The first term "...indicates that in death Dasein is cut off from relations with others. The term has accordingly been translated as 'non-relational', in the sense of 'devoid of relationships'." (ibid, pg. 294) The second term refers to the fact that Dasein "As potentiality for being...cannot outstrip the possibility for death. Death is the possibility of the absolute impossibility of Dasein." (ibid)

keep his ownmost non-relational possibility-of-being completely concealed. In this manner the "One" provides constant tranquillization about death. At bottom however, this is a tranquillization not only for him who is 'dying' but just as much for those who console him. ...³⁰

Being toward death as "One" turns out to be flight in the face of death. "Das Man" tries to divert Dasein's attention from taking its death seriously, by making death a continuation of life, e.g., speaking of death as sleeping and resting and the cosmetic preparation of the corpse; but these practices result instead in a tending toward flight from life by making it death-like. This is seen in Dasein's endeavor to temporalize itself inauthentically by closing itself off from an open future in which it is its "not-yet", that is, it does not appropriate or make the possibility of its nothingness its own. To avoid this appropriation, it temporalizes itself inauthentically by "...temporalizing an infinite time out of the finite".³¹ We have already mentioned the use of the temporally qualifying terms such as "continually", "ever", "forever", and "always" above on page 60 (and we might also include the negative "never" with these) to show the way Dasein's speaking reflects the

30. *ibid*, pg. 297

31. *ibid*, pg. 379

"fixedness" of the past made present. It seems especially appropriate here to remind ourselves that the reason Dasein attempts to rigidify its speaking by using absolutes is that it attempts to flee its finitude by negating it--by making what is finite, infinite. In fact Dasein expresses its "ill will against time" by referring to it as "the grim reaper". To inauthentic Dasein, time is the adversary that robs it of its dream of immortality. Dasein seeks to evade its nothingness by creating a temporal structure which ignores or closes itself off from its "not-yet" by making its past present in an infinite series of "nows" and projecting this past as static ahead of itself; in effect, making the changing changeless. Thus Dasein attempts refusal of being its not-yet.

Heidegger proposes an alternative mode of communication in which Dasein can relate to its finitude. It is admittedly not to be exemplified in ordinary speaking, rather it is an extra-ordinary mode of speaking requiring a break with the security of publicness, and the willingness to traverse the abyss of nothingness, creating its own path as it goes. It is this possibility that we will explore in the next chapter.

Chapter III

Extra-ordinary Speaking: The Authentic Mode of Communication

The previous chapter which dealt with everyday speaking showed how Dasein becomes aware that this mode of speaking is deficient, in that as speaker, it is unable to disclose its place in the contextual network of relationships of what it speaks about because it covers this dimension over by dispersing itself in publicness. Thus Dasein in ignoring the ontological dimension of speech, discovers there is a lack of meaning in inauthentic speech. Just as the man in Plato's cave analogy¹ is drawn out of the dim light of the cave and must adjust his eyes to the difference in the intensity of light, so too, inauthentic Dasein, in taking up its task of coming into being, must move along its path, its pace set by the growth of this awareness. Its way is unsure for it has given up the comfortable dictatorship of conventional speech and now must forge its own path in speaking authentically. It does not leave everyday speaking behind in

1. Please see Chapter II, pg. 35 Ft.N. 1.

turning to authentic speech, but rather transforms everyday speech by "restoring" the ontological dimension to it. This needs clarification; for it is really not a case of restoring a dimension which is not already there, rather Dasein "remembers" his rootedness in being by attending (listening) to the call of conscience and responding to its appeal to gather (legein) the Self that was dispersed in its everyday speaking, thus letting the ontological dimension be seen.

The imposition of three constitutive aspects can disclose* the growth in Dasein's awareness of authentic speaking, emphasizing the manner in which each part moves Dasein along its path toward being. In listening and speaking authentically, Dasein, as the wanderer², is always on the way toward being; a way in which

* Just as dispersal could never be complete leaving Dasein totally in the dark, so too, the gathering of the Self (legein) is, in the same manner, never complete; Dasein is not totally disclosed as being in the light.

2. The metaphor of Dasein as wanderer points to the fact that being present in a situation is dynamic rather than static: for to be is to be on the way. Even the ancients understood that static being there is not intelligible, e.g., Zeno's arrow at rest paradox.

learning to "dwell" in such speech is both a labor of nobility and one of stress. To the degree that Dasein "remembers" its task, that is, to the degree that listening willingly turns toward this dimension in hearing authentically, will it be able to respond in its speaking in an authentic manner. Both a call and a response, namely a disposition and an action are required for speech to be authentic: the first aspect will show a "raison d'etre" that attracts, appeals or turns Dasein toward authentic speech which reveals being: for why should Dasein care about an alternative mode of speaking such as the authentic?; in the second part, it is equally necessary to show that, as an active response in the face of this call, what is required is the resolve to bear the burden of being, the courage to "own" up to the responsibility of resolutely embracing the finitude that it is in its speaking, thereby speaking authentically. The third element is one of homecoming. Firmly on its way (in light of its resolve) Dasein, as authentic speaker, discloses its Self as "for being and against nothing".

Standing in a proper relationship* to being in speaking authentically, Dasein, as this clearing, is on the way out of the darkness and into the light.

In tracing Dasein's growth of awareness through these three constituent elements, we must come to grips with the following questions along the way: Just what is extra-ordinary about our listening and speaking in this mode of communication? Who is the listener and speaker? What does such speaking speak about? Who is spoken to? How does this attempted modification of everyday speech transform (if it does at all) Dasein's being-in-the-world and being-with-others? Finally, is authentic speech sufficient unto itself?

Now and then another speaks to Dasein in a manner that is different from its everyday speaking, for it seems to reveal the

* "The human essence shows itself here to be the relation which first opens up being to man. Being-human, as the need of apprehension and collection, is being driven into the freedom of his undertaking techne, the sapient embodiment of being. This is the character of history", (Introduction to Metaphysics, pg. 42).

truth³ about Dasein and the nature of its relationship to entities (things and other Dasein) as one of care which tries to take into account "...the full structure of its possibilities"⁴ as its own. This mode of speaking which discloses Dasein in this manner is called extraordinary or authentic speaking. In order to understand authentic speech it is first necessary to consider how Dasein modifies everyday existence so that it becomes authentic. This modification will then be reflected in Dasein's speaking authentically.

There is nothing esoteric about the term "authentic":

Authentic existence is not something that floats above dispersing everydayness existentially, it is only a modified way in which such everydayness is seized upon.⁵

-
3. Heidegger defines "truth" as "uncoveredness" (aletheia) "...In so far as Dasein is its disclosedness essentially, and discloses and uncovers as something disclosed, to this extent it is essentially 'true'. Dasein is in truth. This assertion has meaning ontologically. It does not purport that Dasein is introduced to all the 'truth', either always or just in every case but rather that the disclosedness of its ownmost being belongs to its existential constitution." (Being and Time, pg. 263).
 4. The Meaning of Heidegger, pg. 23
 5. Being and Time, pg. 224.

It is crucial therefore that the reader resist the "mystique"* that has grown in recent years concerning authenticity qua authenticity. This mystique is made up of several elements. Perhaps the following three illustrate it most clearly. First there is the question whether authenticity is mysterious** in the sense that it has to do with otherworldliness; but on the contrary, Heidegger points out that "...authentic being-one's Self does not detach Dasein from the world..."⁶. Second, an element of the mystique which is actually inconsistent with its supposed 'otherworldliness' is mis-hearing it as a mere subjectivity, an excuse for "doing your own thing"; but Heidegger emphasizes the mistakenness of this perspective: "...man, having forgotten what is in totality, adopts measures. ...He

* The distinction should be made between the mistakes of inauthentic Dasein under the influence of "Das Man" and authentic Dasein which, having set out on its journey toward being, needs to clarify its understanding of specific elements such a journey entails.

** As we shall see there is a note of mystery concerning authenticity, due to the fact that while being is disclosed in extraordinary speaking, it is not exhausted in this disclosure so that there is something left over and there is a sense of mystery.

6. *ibid*, pg. 344

is the more mistaken the more exclusively he takes himself as the measure of all things."⁷ Finally, the claim of the mystique that authenticity is speculative non-sense* does not understand that the demand made on behalf of authentic existence and authentic speech is not based on abstract speculation but on experience; that is, authenticity is expressed in being-in-the-world: authentic speech "...discloses the current Situation of the "there" in such a way that existence, in taking action, is circumspectively concerned with what is factically ready-to-hand environmentally."⁸ The force of experience, though rare, is unmistakable when it occurs. We must keep in mind that the word "authentic" and "own"*** have a common root in German namely,

7. Existence and Being, pg. 316

* Cf. Adorno, T., Jargon of Authenticity.

8. Being and Time, pg. 373

** In his essay, "Martin Heidegger and Man's Way To Be", Professor Adamczewski points out that "...the word commonly translated as 'authentic' is 'eigentlich'; it can also be rendered as 'proper' or 'own'. Let me so express these ties of thought: man exists properly as his own self only when he acknowledges or owns himself as owing to being. Existentially, any owning presupposes owing; and the mostly forgotten spirit of the English language will support this, because 'own' originally means as a past participle 'already owed'."

"eigen".⁹ It is this connection that is to be our main focus as we proceed to uncover the structure of the authentic mode of speaking. This is where the correct understanding of the German root of authentic, "eigentlich" enters in: speech which is "authentic" or "extra-ordinary" is that speech in which Dasein not only acknowledges its finitude by restoring a full range of possibilities for itself to choose among but in so doing, Dasein as speaker, projects itself upon this possibility of its being toward death as its ownmost possibility (eigentlich). Thus the restoration of the meaning of human being-there of authentic existence brings Dasein into its rightful relationship to being in speaking authentically.

The above overview allows the reader to have some understanding of the preliminary structure of authentic speech and the elements that Dasein, as speaking authentically, must gather together to dwell in such speech. All this of course has been alluded to in the most general terms whose purpose is to dispose the reader in a proper manner toward a more detailed account of the structure of authentic speaking that is to follow, much in

9. *ibid*, pg. 68 Ft. N.

the way we study a map prior to venturing forth on a complicated journey. Having done this, the way is made ready for the actual journey.

Beginning this first part of Dasein's journey of coming toward its way to be, we shall open our inquiry by asking what would prompt Dasein to break away from the untroubled ambiguity of everyday speaking and venture forth on its own in speaking authentically, braving the discomfort of an uncharted way? For if Dasein, due to its thrownness, is lost in the dispersal of the many, then if it is "...to find itself at all, it must be 'shown' to itself in its possible authenticity."¹⁰ Is there a phenomenon that can bear witness to the possibility of Self being in authentic speech? Conscience can bear witness to the possibility of the authentic Self, for it is conscience that calls Dasein to be its Self in its speaking; this is precisely what authentic speaking means: Dasein speaks authoritatively "out" of its own Self.¹¹

10. *ibid*, pg. 312

11. "Authentic being one's Self does not rest upon an exceptional condition of the subject, a condition that has been detached from being "Das Man"; it is rather an existential modification of the "One"--of the "One" as an essential existential." (Being and Time, pg. 168).

Conscience* as a call is a phenomenon of authentic speech. This means first of all that for Dasein to hear the call of conscience at all, it must have stopped listening to the many; its listening must have been interrupted by an address which "...arouses another kind of hearing."¹², and exhibits characteristics that are opposite to the hearing from which Dasein turns away. While inauthentic listening was characterized by distraction, ambiguity and curiosity concerned with entities that restricts its hearing to this ontic level, authentic listening listens in silence to what it is already disposed to understand; this listening is open to and restores the ontological dimension to listening by admitting the referential significance of phenomena which discloses the meaning of being. It is listening

* In order to avoid misunderstanding the frame within which Heidegger refers to conscience, it is necessary to acquaint (or re-acquaint) the reader with Heidegger's view regarding conscience: "The ontological analysis of conscience, is prior to any description and classification of experiences of conscience, and likewise lies outside any biological 'explanation' of this phenomenon (which would mean its dissolution). But it is also no less distant from a theological exegesis of conscience or any employment of this phenomenon for proofs of God or for establishing an immediate consciousness of God." (Being and Time, pg. 313)

12. *ibid*, pg. 316

which is willing to understand in advance of its being addressed. The calling of conscience is a mode of speech: although conscience calls in silence, it is clearly understood. We must ask the following questions in order to clarify the structure of the call of conscience: "Who is called"?, "What is the call about"?, and finally, "Who does the calling"?. In ascertaining an answer to these questions, we will then ask, "Who speaks"?, in authentic speaking, and Dasein can answer in truth, "I do".

There is that listening and speaking which Dasein experiences only too rarely, which reveals a fundamental truth of who it is in such speaking. The fundamental truth of authentic speaking discloses Dasein's place as one of being a Self which in its network of relationships is responsible for being the source of meaning in the world. This truth both takes Dasein by surprise because it dwells for the most part in the forgetfulness of the busy chatter of the market place and does not expect such disclosure, and yet also it seems that all of its life has been directed toward hearing this speaking. Even so, there is a tension in such listening. For although Dasein is drawn toward authentic speaking as it is drawn toward home--as if all destiny

has driven toward this moment, this listening, this speaking,
there is still a deep uneasiness of being in a strange and
unfamiliar place:

"...:--oh, why have to be human, and, shunning
Destiny, long for Destiny? ...
But because being here amounts to so much, because
all this Here and Now, so fleeting, seems to require
us and strangely concerns us. Us the most fleeting
of all. Just once, everything, only for once. Once
and no more. And we, too, once. And never again.
But this having been once, though only once, having
been once on earth--can it ever be cancelled? 13

This listening is unlike any listening Dasein is used to,
for it hears this speaking as a call of Destiny, a direct appeal
to "One's-Self to become a Self". This call summons Dasein from
its dispersal in publicness to take up its task of disclosing
its Self as being-in-the-world.

Thoreau spoke of the call of conscience in the following
way:

Why should we be in such desperate haste to
succeed and in such desperate enterprises?
If a man does not keep pace with his compan-
ions, perhaps it is because he hears a

13. This passage seems unequivocal enough not to demand
exegesis.
The Fabric of Existentialism, pg. 357, "The Ninth Elegy",
by Rilke.

different drummer. Let him step to the music he hears, however measured and far away. It is not important that he should mature as soon as an apple tree or an oak. ... 14

Conscience is in each case mine. The self given by "Das Man", that public self, will find such a call "alienating" for this public self (Oneself) stands to lose its hold on Dasein in such a call.¹⁵ Such a call is not understood by others as it gets interpreted by a particular Dasein "in accordance with its own possibilities of understanding".¹⁶ Although conscience calls and is therefore discourse it is not communication for there is nothing vocal about such a summons; the appeal is "...not put into words..." but is made in silence--it is "...a giving to understand".¹⁷ As such, the call of conscience is direct and

14. Walden and other writings of Henry David Thoreau, pg. 290

15. Being and Time, pg. 318

"The appeal to the Self in the one-self does not force it inwards upon itself, so that it can close itself off from the 'external world'. The call passes over everything like this and disperses it, so as to appeal solely to that Self which, notwithstanding, is in no other way than Being-in-the-world."

16. *ibid*

17. *ibid*, pg. 316

without mediation. "While the content of the call is seemingly indefinite, the direction it faces is not to be overlooked."¹⁸

This "...giving to understand" of just how Dasein goes about taking up its task of becoming a Self is left indefinite, but that it is to do so seems quite certain. Any misunderstanding that arises is due to Dasein's hearing, which runs the risk of becoming inauthentic if it is publicized, that is, if Dasein listens inappropriately as "One" listens concerned with reducing conscience to an ontic interest.

We can now answer the question of who is called. The answer is: Dasein. We also know that Dasein is called to take up its ownmost possibilities of coming into being.

But how do we answer the question, "who calls"? Dasein itself is the caller. This cannot be an intentional act because as we noted above Dasein is taken by surprise by this call.¹⁹ The call

18. *ibid*, pg. 318

19. *ibid*, pg. 320

"Indeed the call is precisely something which we ourselves have neither planned nor prepared for nor voluntarily performed, nor have we ever done so. 'It' calls (Es ruft...) against our expectations and even against our will. ..."

comes from Dasein but also from "beyond it". What does this mean? It means that this summons is not an act of will, rather Dasein is summoned by conscience as that which calls it steadily. What is that? Anxiety discloses to Dasein that it is "not-at-home" in the world in the face of its own finitude, that its absorption with the world alienates it from its task of acknowledging its relation to being. It is the issue of its finitude in the form of its thrownness, that "in the face of which", Dasein is called to take up its task. The task conscience calls Dasein to take up is the issue of its being, i.e., its potentiality for being a structural whole which it grasps* as the fundamental structure of its existence. Therefore the call of conscience is the call of care in which time (in authentic ecstases) is manifested as the horizon of being.

Conscience manifests itself as the call of care: the caller is Dasein, which in its thrownness (in its being-already-in) is anxious about its potentiality for being. ...The call of conscience--that is, conscience itself, has its ontological possibility in the fact that Dasein in the very basis of its being is care. 20

* We shall see that the possibility of grasping its Self as a whole, that is, the way Dasein temporalizes its Self is the foundation of the Self, rather than the Self being the basis for temporality.

20. *ibid*, pg. 322

The call of conscience leads Dasein to the realization that it is "owing"* and that "...its basic ontological meaning is found to be a "deficiency" or lack of something which ought to and can be, the ground of negativity** (Nichtigkeit)".²¹

Grounded as Dasein is between being and nothing it must continually overtake its Self in its finitude; that this effort must be continual is due to the fact that facticity is imposed on Dasein's existence, ever challenging it to win its Self anew. Dasein experiences its thrownness recurrently in its existence thus requiring the re-transcendence of the existent Self in every situation. Dasein must accept the negativity which is unavoidable in its being and gather its Self from its dispersal in

* The German word for "owing" is "schuldig" which is usually translated as "guilty". The use of "guilty" which carries with it the idea of punishment in the English translation tends to lead the reader astray from Heidegger's intention of emphasizing the "negativity" that Dasein is.

** The substitution of "negativity" for "nullity" occurs because "nullity" is an absolutely vacuous notion, and also has connection with mathematics as a 'quantitative' reference, while 'negativity' is not a potential problem. Therefore, it is preferable to substitute this alternative expression naming that from which this concrescence emerges.

21. Existence and Being, pg. 69

ordinary speaking in the face of this negativity. In accepting this ground between being and nothing as the basis of its finitude, Dasein willingly takes up its task of coming into being, i.e., it lets itself be called into being in choosing to disclose its Self--as a whole in speaking authentically:

I am a wanderer and a mountain climber, he said to his heart; I do not like the plains, and it seems I cannot sit still for long. And whatever may yet come to me as destiny and experience will include some wandering and mountain climbing: in the end, one experiences only oneself. The time is gone when mere accidents could still happen to me; and what could still come to me now that was not mine already? What returns, what finally comes home to me, is my own self and what of myself has long been in strange lands and scattered among all things and accidents. ...²²

In wanting to have a conscience, we find the second constituent element in growth of Dasein's awareness. Being disposed to listen toward the summons to be a Self from its Self, Dasein may be said to be resolute: "--this reticent self-projection upon one's ownmost owing, in which we are ready for anxiety--we call resoluteness".²³ It is when Dasein listens authentically and hears

22. Thus Spake Zarathustra, pg. 264

23. Being and Time, pg. 343

speech disclose what is spoken about in its referential totality, that such listening includes its Self in this network of contextual relations in a meaningful way. This meaningful listening constitutes the significance of a destiny; as being its destiny Dasein understands that human being is for saying, that is, Dasein responds to this summons of conscience by disclosing its Self as a structural whole in exhibiting its being-in-the-world when it shows its Self as speaker:

"Appropriation (Ereignis) in beholding human nature, makes mortals appropriate for that which avows itself from everywhere to man in Saying, which points toward the concealed. Man's, the listener's, being made appropriate for Saying, has this distinguishing character, that it releases human nature into its own, but only in order that man as he who speaks, that is, he who says, may encounter and answer Saying, in virtue of what is his property. It is: the sounding of the word, the encountering saying of mortals is answering. Every spoken word is already an answer: counter-saying, coming to encounter, listening Saying..."²⁴

If ordinary listening and speaking were characterized by their publicness, then authentic listening and speaking may be said to be characterized as "original" i.e., that speech which in belonging to one's-Self discloses that Self as originating in being (original). In the primary sense this mode of speech

24. On The Way To Speech, pg. 129

(discourse) is one in which authentic Dasein discloses its Self-as-being-in-the-world. In the first, inauthentic mode, speech disclosed Dasein in its inauthenticity, as taking its meaning from the world, that is, in determining itself in terms of the world. It is resoluteness which frees Dasein from its absorbing concern with the everyday world by modifying its temporal structure:

In resoluteness, the Present is not only brought back from distraction with objects of one's closest concern, but it gets held in the future and in having been. That Present which is held in authentic temporality and which is authentic itself, we call the "moment of vision".
 ...'In the moment of vision' nothing can occur; but as an authentic waiting towards, the moment of vision permits us to encounter for the first time what can be 'in a time' as ready to hand or present at hand.²⁵

Freed from the inauthentic mode Dasein can thus turn to the second mode, original speech, in which authentic Dasein discloses itself in disclosing the world.²⁵ In the second, "original" speech, authentic Dasein discloses its Self in disclosing the world, i.e., in letting entities be seen, as they are in their being, thereby "...realizing its responsibility as the unique source of meaning

25. Being and Time, pg. 387-88

in the world..."²⁶ Authentic speech lets what is spoken about be seen as what it is, that is, it lets entities show themselves in their contextual completeness. This "letting-be-seen" is what Heidegger finds in communication:

"...In discourse (*ᾠπέφαισις*), so far as it is genuine, what is said [was geredet ist] is drawn from what the talk is about, so that discursive communication, in what it says [in ihrem Gesagten], makes manifest what it is talking about, thus making it accessible to the other party. This is the structure of the *λόγος* as *ᾠπέφαισις*. (Its structural form is *συρθεσις*). Here synthesis has a purely apophantical signification and means letting it be seen in its togetherness [Beisammen] with something--letting it be seen as something. ..."27

"Original" has the meaning here of disclosing what was unnamed and therefore hidden, and in naming it, bringing it to light. But this also means that this mode of speech does more than note that entities are disclosed within a context in general; it gives consideration to this context as manifesting a network of relationships in their specificity, to which meaning accrues. To put it another way: because the context varies, the network of relationships varies too, and therefore there is no fixed meaning to what

26. The Meaning of Heidegger, pg. 28

27. Being and Time, pg. 56

is shown. To fix meaning is to abstract entities from their context; this in turn covers them over or hides them, as happened in inauthentic speaking. Therefore, authentic speaking is also "original" in the sense of showing the being of entities, that is, illuminating existence in a creative, open, imaginative and fresh way.

In everyday existence, Dasein comes up against the dictatorship of "Das Man" which inauthentically addresses Dasein seeking its assent by inviting it to respond in kind. Thoreau's dialogue with his tailoress lends itself to our closer scrutiny as an instance of authentic speech:

When I ask for a garment of a particular form, my tailoress tells me gravely, "They do not make them so now," not emphasizing the "They" at all, as if she quoted an authority as impersonal as the Fates, and I find it difficult to get made what I want, simply because she cannot believe that I mean what I say, that I am so rash. When I hear this oracular sentence, I am for a moment absorbed in thought, emphasizing to myself each word separately that I may come at the meaning of it, that I may find out by what degree of consanguinity, They are related to me, and what authority they may have in an affair which affects me so nearly; I am inclined to answer her with equal mystery, and without any more emphasis of the "they"---"It is true they did not make them so recently, but they do now."²⁸

28. Walden and other writings of Henry David Thoreau, pg. 22

In replying to Thoreau's request for a garment cut in a particular fashion, the tailoress responds inauthentically. On what basis do we make this claim? She could have responded in the following ways: "I must send away for a pattern for such a garment."; "I don't know how to make a pattern for the garment you want."; or she might even have replied in a negative manner such as, "I have not made such a garment, nor do I want to.". Instead, the tailoress proposes that "they" take the responsibility for the garment's unavailability by bringing the authority of the amorphous "they" to bear on the situation.

In contrast to the tailoress's conventional speaking, Thoreau, in listening authentically, apprehends her invitation to give his assent to such dispersal. Will Thoreau indeed take the easy way out by giving his Self over to dispersal in publicness in his response or gather his Self, that is, bring his Self to stand forth as speaker, in speaking authentically? In questioning his relationship to "them", Thoreau takes hold of the situation by

firmly willing (resolving)²⁷ to be a Self in responding authentically. His response modifies the self as "One" of many, under the Self. Thus speaking authentically, does not mean that conventional speech is left behind*, rather conventional speech is transformed.

The modification of inauthentic speech takes place when Dasein responds to the call of conscience appropriately in its resoluteness and becomes the Self out of which it speaks (e.g., as in Thoreau's case when he replies as himself, "They did not make them so recently, but they do now".) In understanding that its potentiality for being includes both un-truth and truth, depending on its decision to be the "not-I" of in-authentic speech or, like

27. Introduction to Metaphysics, pg. 17

"To question is to will to know. He who wills, he who puts his whole existence into a will is resolved. Resolve does not shift about, it does not shirk, but acts out of the moment and never stops. Resolve is no mere decision to act, but the crucial beginning of action that anticipates and reaches through all action. To will is to be resolved...." [The essence of willing is here carried back to determination [Ent-schlossenheit, unclosedness ...] The connection of resolve with clearing and letting be follows in the quote but we must put off dealing with these crucial concepts until we have reached a more appropriate point below, (see pg. 111).

* Just as inauthentic existence is not left behind in Dasein's struggle to exist authentically, so too, authentic speech does not leave inauthentic speech behind.

Thoreau to be the Self out of which it speaks, Dasein takes hold of un-truth authentically.²⁸ The resolve to illuminate existence frees Dasein from the dictatorship of "Das Man" in ordinary speech and discloses its Self in authentic speaking as being in truth. The choice to be an authentic speaker is not made apart from being-in-the-world and being-with-others, rather these structures are disclosed in light of Dasein's finitude in concrete situation in which Dasein exemplifies its potentiality for being in its transparency.

In speaking authentically, Dasein uses metaphors, adages, aphorisms, and similes just as it did in its everyday speaking, but now instead of covering over its finitude, through them Dasein discloses the meaning of human being as finite. The purpose of speaking authentically, then, is the disclosure of man's place in being as being finite. The following are examples of authentic speech precisely because they illuminate existence in just such a

28. "As care, however, Dasein has been Determined by facticity and dispersal. Disclosed in its 'there' it maintains itself both in truth and in un-truth with equal primordiality. This 'really' holds in particular for resoluteness as authentic truth. Resoluteness appropriates un-truth authentically. (Being and Time, pg. 345)

manner: "God is dead"²⁹ and the "Eclipse of God"³⁰ are surely alternative ways of speaking about the self-same human relation, ways which express genuinely different ontologically-grounded attitudes to similar moments of human existence. In recalling Caesar's words as he crossed the Rubicon river, "the die is cast"³¹, the saying no longer reveals what it revealed originally in merely referring to Caesar's particular situation, but the claim that decision closes off some possibilities in choosing this one, is meaningful, as it reveals a recurring structure in the experience of various Dasein, namely that freedom (choice) discloses man as finite "For everything there is a season, and a time for every matter under heaven: a time to be born and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck what is planted."³² This is the first among a list of opposites given in Ecclesiastes concerning happenings in time. It is not that man is to concern himself only with the proper time of each thing but rather with the propriety

29. The Joyful Wisdom, pg. 125

30. Eclipse of God, Martin Buber

31. Julius Caesar

32. Ecclesiastes 3:2

of time as such. This list of opposites reminds man that what is proper to him is his finitude; time is the horizon on which being becomes man, in which man as human being is bound to live out his life. Finally the speech of that lover, who meeting the pain of the loss of his beloved, affirms existence in the face of finitude in affirming his love: "It is better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all."³³ These expressions are born of Dasein's attempts to come to terms with its thrownness in a particular situation and as such, to state the truth (concerning its finitude) about the being of Dasein's way to be. The following example, while not fitting in the above classification, nevertheless fulfills the same purpose, namely the disclosure of man's place as finite through negation. The modification of convention which involves the ethical dimension can show itself in authentic speech in "No-saying", e.g., in saying "No" to having a casual affair not because society does not condone it, or religious sanction forbids it--but because Dasein does not choose such a relationship as a way to be of its ownmost being. "No saying" speaks out of the authentic Self in a more forceful way than the preceding examples

33. In Memoriam, Tennyson

even show, indicating that what is proper to Dasein is that it is itself that relationship which discloses being and this it does in authentically speaking out of its Self; speaking which discloses man as being between being and nothing and in choosing to be speaker chooses being.

Resolve not only frees Dasein from the imposition of "Das Man", thereby coming to have a Self out of which it speaks, but because it speaks authentically and discloses this resolution in its speaking, Dasein can "call" others to take up their task of becoming a Self. There are those few who share our path and "help" us on our way. In using the word, "help", it must be in no way understood that the other takes pity on us as Buber would have us believe is Heidegger's only possibility of community³⁴ (authentically being there with the other); it is not like this at all. The other, having taken up his ownmost task, calls us forth to do likewise. Socrates comes to mind as an example of calling

34. Between Man and Man, pg. 207

Man is never a community in the sense Buber puts forth. In Heidegger's discussion of a maxim of Parmenides, he declares: "...Man's selfhood means this: he must transform the being that discloses itself to him into history and bring himself to stand in it. Selfhood does not mean that he is primarily an "ego" and an individual. This he is no more than he is a we, a community." (Introduction to Metaphysics, pg. 121)

others to conscience. His call comes from the heart, out of concern for their neglect of their task of Self-understanding. His continual questioning of popular opinion (conventional wisdom) made him a threat to the comfortable dispersal of the many. At his trial Socrates reminds the community that he pleads not in his own behalf but in theirs, that he may prod or stir them to take up the challenge of becoming themselves:

It is literally true, even if it sounds rather comical, that God has specially appointed me to this city, as though it were a large thorough-bred horse which because of its great size is inclined to be lazy and needs the stimulation of some stinging fly. It seems to me that God has attached me to this city to perform the office of such a fly and all day long I never cease to settle here, there and everywhere, rousing, persuading and reproving everyone of you.³⁵

This speaking does not originate with the other, rather the other addresses himself to me and it is my already awakened primordial being, that is disposed, in listening to the call of conscience to respond to what is made manifest in his speaking. What is made manifest in his speaking is his rootedness in being and it is this ground which we share in our mutual disclosure. This "being-with" differs from that of ordinary speech due to

35. Apology, 30 d - e

resolution. In speaking authentically, resolution brings this shared ground "within reach" (brings this shared ground into view) for Dasein. For being with others resolutely, that is, respecting their potentiality for being, lets other Dasein be them-Selves.

It becomes possible:

...to co-disclose this potentiality in the solitude which leaps forth and liberates. When Dasein is resolute, it can become the 'conscience' of Others. Only by authentically being-their-Selves in resoluteness can people authentically be with one another--not by ambiguous and jealous stipulations and talkative fraternizing in the crowd and in what the "many" want to undertake. 36

Polonius' parting words to Laertes is also an example of a call to conscience that issues from a possibly inauthentic Dasein but nevertheless when heard aright discloses the truth of who man is:

This above all: to thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
thou canst not then be false to any man. 37

36. Being and Time, pg. 344

37. Just as authentic speech can be covered over by inauthentic listening, the possibility exists that what is spoken inauthentically (as in Polonius' case because this passage is interpreted by some as an "old saw" by a sententious old man and by others as an example of Shakespeare's own wisdom) may disclose the truth when it is heard authentically.

Resolution brings the third element to light which is one of homecoming. The growth of Dasein's awareness has brought it to the point of gathering its Self in speaking authentically, from its dispersal in inauthentic speaking. Dasein discloses its Self in this speaking acknowledging the claim of being, that is, of being that relation out of which it speaks in speaking authentically. But this gathering is not of the nature of a "collage" in which bits and pieces of flotsam are glued together into a Self:

...It is logos as ingathering, as man's collecting-himself toward fitness ~~(Fug)~~ that first brings being-human into its essence, so thrusting it into homelessness, insofar as the home is dominated by the appearance of the ordinary, customary and commonplace.³⁸

This gathering is the bringing together in the way of maintaining disparate elements in tension. Man maintains his Self as the between of being and nothing and discloses himself as such in speaking authentically. Our focus on this third aspect concerns Dasein's awareness of itself as authentic speaker which discloses its Self as being ever on the way home, drawing ever closer to being*.

38. Introduction to Metaphysics, pg. 142

* There is no implication here that drawing closer to being is the result of human intentionality (this attitude would return us to the problem of "insistence") for as we shall see, it is being that draws man closer.

Coming home for human being is placing its Self in this between as being speaker--more fundamentally as being this between, as making a place³⁹, in its speaking for being in the face of its finitude.

Homecoming then, is Dasein's coming to "dwell" in this between, disclosing such habitation in its speaking authentically. This means becoming aware that "dwelling" has a dual nature, neither side of which may be excluded.

Where conventional speech afforded inauthentic Dasein the comfort and tranquility of not being responsible for its speaking, Dasein, in disclosing its rootedness in being in speaking authentically, thereby discloses its relationship to being as one of privilege and also one of anxiety. For what distinguishes man from all other entities is that he alone can disclose being in speaking in letting it enter into the word, as the following lines from Rilke's The Ninth Elegy so richly portray. The following exegesis (with the reader's indulgence) can help us better understand the three elements mentioned above through which Dasein moves toward authentic speech:

39. Here we must take heed of Heidegger's warning not to think that Dasein takes its orientation from the "between" as such, rather Dasein is its Self this "between". Thus as this "between" Dasein in the "being-there" of its being is the "clearing" for being. We will return to this point shortly. (See Heidegger's discussion of this point in Being and Time, pg. 170-171)

...For the wanderer doesn't bring from the mountain slope a handful of earth to the valley, untellable earth, but only some word he has won, a pure word, the yellow and blue gentian. Are we, perhaps, here just for saying: House, Bridge, Fountain, Gate, Jug, Olive Tree, Window,--possibly: Pillar, Tower?... but for saying, remember, oh, for such saying as never the things themselves hoped so intensely to be. ...⁴⁰

There is a disturbing note in the very first line. Rilke describes Dasein as a "wanderer", No, that is not quite strong enough. The line reads, "For the wanderer...". What difference does the emphasis of a change in the use of an article make? In the first sense, being a wanderer* is an accidental characteristic which may or may not be of importance. The use of the proper article does make a difference, since it suggests that being a wanderer is not accidental but a part of man's essential nature, or stronger still, the heart of such a nature.

The wanderer brings something to our attention, something that he has brought from "the mountain slope to the valley" (from afar to here?). That "something" is given by contrast: it is first given as what it is not. We are told that what is brought is not

40. The Fabric of Existentialism, pg. 358, "The Ninth Elegy", by Rilke.

* See page 73 this chapter.

a "handful of earth". Admittedly this is not very helpful, but this "handful of earth" does have a negative characteristic; it is "untellable"; this means, if we take Rilke literally, that this "earth" is un-able to tell. Unable to tell what? We don't know yet. Juxtaposed to "untellable earth" is--"...but only some word he has won, a pure word, the yellow and blue gentian." The "...but only some" jumps out at us. "You mean the "poor" wanderer has come all this way to bring us "...but only some word he has won..."? It is as if the struggle to win the word and the journey to bring such a prize seem hardly worthwhile. But is this really the case or is there something hidden that somehow off-sets the "...but only..."?

First of all this "questionable" prize is a "pure word". It is not clear whether Rilke has in mind "pure" in the sense of its being "free from defects" or "virginal" as in the sense that it is an unused word. This remains unclear so far.* Our second clue is given by means of metaphor; the "word" is "the yellow and blue

* Is it possible that "pure" has to do with the way naming gives a fresh context in letting entities be seen as what they are in the word? This is admittedly a speculative point as far as Rilke's poem is concerned, but it is nonetheless a possibility which has merit in so far as it is in keeping with the task of this chapter.

gentian". Gentian are flowers found in the Alps. High above the last timberstand and most vegetation, the hiker or mountain climber comes upon them unexpectedly, finding them nestled among the rocks in the snow. Against the grey of the rock and the white of the snow, the brilliant colors of these fragile flowers seem an unexpected gift. Their being found in the clearing, where little else grows and what does grow has to struggle for survival, is not lost upon the on-looker.

But what is Rilke's point? The point is made by use of two contrasting moods in raising the question: "Are we, perhaps here just for saying?"; he then lists the names that man gives to entities but the reader's response to the list of names is possibly one of impatience and boredom. If it is so much the better, for there is nothing that drives a point home like having the reader disclose the author's meaning for him. The key word is "remember". Rilke is asking the reader, who at the beginning of the poem perhaps saw such a "prize" and "journey" as "hardly worthwhile", to remember that speech is man's privilege; that in naming things he lets them be. It is a point that man takes for granted in his forgetfulness. Thus, we find two contrasting moods, forgetfulness and remembrance: the wanderer, in letting being

dwell within the word, in naming things, takes an almost casual attitude toward this en-nobling gift, one of forgetfulness, until he remembers that except for such saying the privilege that sets man apart from things is hidden from view. That which man takes for granted and seems of little or no consequence is truly a rich gift, it is not a gift to be taken lightly, for it is through speech that being is made manifest in letting entities be seen as what they are. As speaker, that man, in taking up his task, intensifies existence in a way that being a thing cannot, i.e., the earth cannot tell its nature. Let us make Rilke's point even more emphatic. Man, in disclosing being, i.e., in letting entities be seen as what they are, in speaking authentically, discloses that his nature is the disclosure of being; that man is--in disclosing the being of entities. Man is indeed here for Saying. The meaning of human being is Saying, (disclosure).

In surveying the above exegesis, we find we are left with the feeling that we have tied all loose threads neatly together; well, all that is, except two small ones. The two small thoughts we have left unattended are privilege and "letting things be" in naming them. The two are connected, so let us pose our question in such

a way that they are both included. In what sense is naming things a privilege? Why for instance, do we say privilege and not right? Well, for one thing, right would imply mastery which leads to distortion due to neglect of the ontological dimension. Privilege indeed implies that naming things, that bringing the being of entities to stand in the word is not man's doing. Man names that which gives itself.

In what way then, are we to understand resolution in connection with letting being give itself? It is possible that the word "appropriation" leads to a mis-understanding in that man might seem to acquire a possession of the being of entities in some way? The answer is no; no sense of possession is involved, as a matter of fact just the opposite is the case. Perhaps we should abandon the word "appropriation" for the moment and instead use the word "apprehension". We must take care here however that we do not incur the same misunderstanding that we did with "appropriation". Therefore, we must begin by stressing that:

...Apprehension...is not a faculty belonging to a man already defined; apprehension is rather a process in which man first enters into history as a being, an essent, i.e., comes into being.

Apprehension is not a function that man has as an attribute but...is the happening that has man. ...The separation between being and being-human comes to light in this togetherness. 41

Apprehension, then, is a receptive attitude toward being.

Dasein-releases its hold on entities, a hold which confines them to the ontic dimension and this it does through a "proper" disposition which acknowledged the hold being has on man:

Apprehension is not just a pastime that man takes up in his idle hours, or to-exercise his "spiritual" or "psychological" faculties:

No, apprehension is wrested from the habitual press of living--and by a contrary movement. Its bond with the being of the essent does not make itself. To name is not merely to ascertain a fact, but points to the struggle by which it is forged. ...41a

Let us return to appropriation. It is to be understood in the same way. Appropriation is:

The yielding owning,...(which) confers more than any effectuation, making or founding. ... (It is) the giving yield whose giving reach alone is what gives us such things as a "there is"... . 42

41. Introduction to Metaphysics, pg. 119

41a ibid, pg. 141

42. On the Way to Speech, pg. 127

Thus privilege is a granting to man by being of that to which man belongs. Saying, grants man a hold on being and in speaking authentically man takes up the way that is proper to him:

...the significance of speech, its signing and marking, forming role for man can be wholly remembered when it is derived from its ground, when its demand belongs not to beings expressed but to the horizon on which they emerge--the horizon of being as such. His proper speech is for each man his Ex-pressed Hold In Being: in his human being.

Speech is man's power to anchor himself in being, his security, his record, his witness, prior to his manipulation of entities. 43

Does this bring us any closer to understanding the second part of the question concerning "letting being give itself"? Is Heidegger suggesting Dasein is to be indifferent to the being of entities, that it let entities sort of "hang out" in the vicinity while Dasein decides whether or not to take notice of them as it would any other thing? Heidegger is quite clear that the "letting-be of what is" is not to be mis-construed as indifference or neglect:

The phrase we are now using, namely the "letting-be" of what is, does not however, refer to indifference and neglect, but to the very opposite of them. To let something be (seinlassen) is in fact to have something to do with it (sich einlassen auf). This is not to be taken merely in the sense of pursuing, conserving, cultivating and planning

43. Tragic Protest, pg. 251

some actuality causally met with or sought out. To let what-is be what it is means participating in something overt and its overtness, in which everything that "is" takes up its position and which entails such overtness. Western thought at its outset conceived this as *τὰ ἀληθέα* the unconcealed. ...Participation in the revealed nature of what is does not stop there, it develops into a retirement before it so that what-is may reveal itself as what and how it is, and the approximation which represents it in the statement may take it for a criterion. In this manner "letting-be" exposes itself (setzt sich aus) to what-is-as-such and brings all behavior into the open (versetzt ins offene).⁴⁴

The open into which the "letting-be" of Saying brings man is what Heidegger also calls the "clearing". What is it that is cleared? Dasein is itself "cleared" in that wanting to be the Self out of which it speaks, it emerges from being-covered over (as being the "not-I" that speaks in ordinary speaking), out of the darkness of this covering, into the light:

The light* which constitutes this clearedness...
 --is what we have defined as "care".
 ...Ecstatical temporality clears the 'there' primordially.⁴⁵

44. Existence and Being, pg. 305-6. From the essay "On the Essence of Truth".

* We must repeat Heidegger's warning that "light" "...is not something ontically present-at-hand as a power source for a radiant brightness occurring in the entity on occasion." Being and Time, pg. 401)

45. Being and Time, pg. 402

Extra-ordinary listening and speaking give full "play" to all three ecstases of temporality, past, present and future with acknowledgement of course to the special emphasis on the openness of the future in which the past comes toward the present out of the future. There is no attempt to cover over or exclude any one moment of temporality from the other two. The three moments are unified and it is this unity which forms the horizon of being, the field upon which being and man be-long. Authentic speech discloses Dasein as speaker, as being in proper relationship to time and in this way time as the horizon of being brings Dasein into the clearing of being. The clearing then is a place of truth; place meaning a different way of being*:

...any being can only be as being, if it stands out and into what is cleared in this clearing. Only this clearing yields and warrants for us men a passage toward what is other than ourselves.⁴⁶

The clearing grants direct access to truth** which means the openness

* ...The very way-to-be of truth is primal strife which is striven for in that open medium into which beings stand out and through which they repose in themselves. (Origin of the Work of Art, pg.43)

46. Origin of the Work of Art, pg. 41. Tr. Dr. Z. Adamczewski.

** The reader must be reminded that nature of truth for Heidegger is "...discoveredness which at the same time under the sway of 'refusal...'" as was pointed out in the introduction. Therefore "access" to truth provided by the "clearing" never is clearing without covering or to put it another way in speaking authentically Dasein never moves out of the darkness and into the light once and for all. This point will be made again in the conclusion.

of being-there of human being is brought to stand in being. Freedom⁴⁷ is freedom to move toward being which draws man toward it as giving itself to him but at the same time it is also the way which becomes him in his human being. Authentic speech is extraordinary in that the disclosure of being as "extra" dimension, that is, the dimension of truth, is shown. In disclosing its Self as being-in truth, truth is restored to the rightful domain of being, whereas in everyday speech, truth was the property of man.

It is this modification which makes possible Dasein's potentiality for grasping itself as a whole, that is, for having a Self at all. This modification of temporality in everyday speech sets Dasein's mis-relation to time right by restoring the future to its proper place. Dasein's speech is authentically temporalized by "letting-itself-come-toward-itself out of the future..."⁴⁸;

47. "...freedom is a participation in the revealment of what-is-as-such (das Seiende als ein solches). The revelation of this is itself guaranteed in that ex-istent participation whereby the overtness of the overt (die Offenheit des Offenens), i.e., "There" (Da) of it, is what it is." (Existence and Being, pg. 307, from the essay, "On The Essence of Truth").

48. Being and Time, pg. 273

Dasein expresses its negativity as its ownmost possibility for being, which in coming toward Dasein frees it for the joyful creativity of an open horizon in which new meaning is possible. At the same time, in giving up its attitude of revenge (reminiscent of Nietzsche) toward the fixedness of the past and its "it was" in its authentic speaking, Dasein can, by accepting responsibility for the past, respectfully glean the richness of meanings it offers, thereby preserving its originality as a guide for the future. And what of the present?

Without the need to distort either the future or the past, the present too is modified; instead of being an infinite series of "nows" which manifested the fixedness of the past made present closed off from the future, the present, as a "moment of vision" reveals the ecstatic structure as whole, i.e., there, in the present, Dasein can bring the past and future together.

There, in the light of the integration of the three ecstases, being is revealed, enabling Dasein in its authentic speaking to reveal the meaning of human being. As being this ecstatic unity, Dasein moves out of the darkness and into the light, again and again.

Our purpose in discussing the Rilke poem is to call attention to the two characteristics exhibited in Dasein's coming to speak authentically: We have spoken of speech as a privilege but said little of the feeling that man is "not-at-home" in authentic speech. Man's understanding "that he is (indeed) here\for Saying", grows slowly as he becomes aware of what it means to speak authentically. As this awareness grows, Dasein more willingly grasps the anxiety of not being ~~at~~home in this speaking. Homelessness is not dissipated but Dasein reaches toward being in spite of it, "yet as soon as man reflects on homelessness, it is no longer a mystery."⁴⁹ Dasein, as wanderer, must come to understand the nature of his "uncanniness" as the task which he must acknowledge and appropriate, and thus come to dwell" in this speaking. To be more specific, when Dasein is asked "Who listens or speaks"? it says, "I do", speaking out of the source of its Self. As speaker, Dasein will disclose its Self as that relationship which discloses being. The concern of authentic listening and speaking then is being. As speaker, Dasein reveals its Self as standing in relation to being, as THAT relationship which, in its human being, reveals being.

49. Questions in Heidegger's Thought About Being, pg. 15
 Essay by Dr. Z. Adamczewski.

It is this relationship which it discloses to other Dasein in speaking authentically. So that when Dasein is asked, "What is spoken about"?, it can answer that speaking discloses being. When it is asked "Who is spoken to"?, the answer is that others, as Selves, hear what is disclosed, and respond to this disclosure in their speaking. Authentic listening and speaking then disclose the between which man is. It discloses that he is between being and nothing and de-cides for being.

Conclusion

The journey toward an understanding of the way communication is constituted, is primarily prompted by the rare but nonetheless profound speaking (extra-ordinary) which is different from the ordinary speaking we engage in, in our day to day living. The difference in these two kinds of speaking is striking, yet in the beginning, perhaps the most we can say is that the one, extra-ordinary, seems to illuminate existence, that is, it provides us with meaning in a way, paradoxically, that the speaking with which we are most familiar and closest to does not. In wondering why and how this is so we are led to ask after the nature of speech itself.

We began by inquiring into the nature of speech and it became clear almost immediately that our focus on speech gave way to the realization that listening is prior to and indeed determines the way speaking discloses being-in-the-world. Listening turns out to be the decisive key in approaching speech.

There are two modes of listening, manipulative and responsive, just as there are two modes of speaking, inauthentic and authentic, which result from the way Dasein listens. Either listening may refuse to admit that which grounds entities; that which, in being named is disclosed in its contextual unity to

listening, in which Dasein's insistence in ignoring this ground can be termed manipulative, or when listening lets speech be itself, that is, it (listening) lets speech disclose the contextual referential totality which gives itself to listening. In this manner, listening may be said to be re-sponsive to what is given in speech.

In the first instance, manipulative listening attempts to abstract entities from the ground out of which they are given in speech in order to confine them on the ontic level in which such preservation re-presents them in their "sameness" along an infinite horizon, e.g., a tree is a tree, is a tree. If you name one tree, you have named them all. Paradoxically, in so doing, listening closes itself off from the open horizon which discloses the meaning of being in speaking; meaning which manipulation claims to seek. Yet this ground is given whether or not listening acknowledges such ground. Listening that is responsive is that listening which in acknowledging this ground restores the ontological dimension to speech in admitting entities in their contextual referential significance.

If listening co-responds to entities speech names in words, then the word discloses the entity in its being, in its contextual totality. Moreover, the word opens the way in gathering what

naming presences, i.e., being. Thus the character of speech emerges only when man ceases to be insistent in his listening; when he frees speech from his domination, speech discloses entities as what they are in the word to listening which admits this dimension to the hearing. The confinement of the mode of being as "having been" under man's manipulation of speech is also transformed when there is forbearance of speech, that is, it is not insistent. The context in which listening lets speech say what is given, is taken into consideration. Speech reflects the givenness of entities as being given in a context. The significance of the context which recognizes the play of all three ecstases, past, present and future, is preserved. The past, the thing as "having been" comes into the present out of the future. This unity of being and time is expressed in human speech as "stillness". The ground and the thing are disclosed in the word as belonging together. This unity is given by speech to be spoken by man. Responsive listening hears that which reaches toward man in speech so that in preserving it he may say what is heard.

The nature of speech then implies that all communication arises out of being, that is, the purpose of speech is to disclose what is given to it; in naming entities, speech shows them as what

they are. Whether speech makes this disclosure in addressing listening depends on the intent of listening which all too often disregards the nature of speech in its insistence on domination of it. The question is why? What is the point of Dasein's insistence in a listening that manipulates speech in confining entities to the ontic dimension forgetting the ontological dimension?

The answer to these questions comes when our inquiry moves toward the two alternative modes of speech disclosed by listening. The first of these two modes is ordinary or inauthentic speaking. Speech is ordinary in that it bears the use of our day to day living, but is inauthentic in that this speaking is that which tends to cover over and confine speech to the ontic dimension.

In seeking to give meaning to its fleeting existence, Dasein attempts to deny its finitude by covering it over in its listening. Subsequently, it tries to manipulate speech in such a way that such insistence discloses human being as infinite. It seeks to accomplish this by dispersing itself as speaker so its speaking cannot disclose it in its finitude. Such attempted dispersal is not total or there could be no possibility of an alternative mode of speaking.

We find three constituent aspects of ordinary speaking which reflect the growth of Dasein's awareness: the first aspect reflects the fact that Dasein is "caught up" in everyday speaking in its fascination with entities. This fascination takes the form of attempting to become like them in dispersing itself in inauthentic speech in an effort to avoid change, in the mistaken belief (mistaken because of the way it manipulates speech) that it can thus escape its destiny as a finite being. The second aspect is characterized by anxiety which frees Dasein from its fascination with entities, making it possible for Dasein to gain some distance from everyday speaking as it faces its finitude. This results in the third aspect which takes the form of a decision either to flee its death by re-absorbing itself in the world or take hold of its finitude.

Thrown into an already established "public" or conventional mode of speaking Dasein drifts along in a state of contentment agreeably giving itself over to such conventionality in an unquestioning manner, mistaking that which prevails in it (publicness) as the whole of reality. In so doing it mistakes its being "One" among many for its Self in thinking it to be speaker. It indulges in "idle talk, gossip and hearsay" for the content of its speaking and directs this speaking to those who, like itself, are caught up in the anonymity of "Das Man".

Recognition of itself as "Das Man" in speaking out of its anonymity is a gradual process in which the degree listening to that which speech speaks of determines the degree Dasein's interest becomes absorbed by entities. Conventional speech, however, in recognizing this factor lessens the impact of possible authentic listening by putting forward its own emphasis on listening as "One" listens. Listening by "One" amounts to listening indifferently in that it abstracts the entity talked about from the ground of being; this is characterized by locating everything in the past. This attempt to confine entities to the past as "having been" seeks to avoid disclosing a network of meaning which includes Dasein. The attempt to forget its finitude by covering it over characterizes Dasein's everyday speaking 'proximally and for the most part'. In dispersing its Self as speaker, there is no Self to stand in relation to disclosure of being. Due to the distortion of the inauthentic ecstases, in which Dasein closes itself off from the future--~~listening~~ hears what it heard, the way it always heard it. This attitude is reflected in speaking which then discloses entities the same way it tends to listen to them, that is by abstracting them from their ground, i.e., disregarding the temporal context in which

they are given. The content becomes interchangeable and the very meaning Dasein seeks to cling to in covering its finitude is lost to it because of this abstraction.

This tendency to alienation of the speaker is encouraged by "Das Man" in its attempt to banalize any original speaking by popularizing it. As speaker it is dispersed into the anonymity of publicness so it won't be included in the referential totality speech itself discloses. What is spoken of is confined to the ontic level in the effort to retain the ongoing meaning of entities so it will have some basis for consideration of its infinity. Those spoken to share in Dasein's dispersal so that they too will not remind Dasein nor be reminded of the finitude of human being.

Dasein cannot give itself over to publicness completely in order to avoid its finitude (although at times it acts as if it were possible to become thing--like i.e., not having its being as an issue for it,) since it can never completely disown itself. If this attitude were fait accompli then there would be no possibility of saying yes or no, for Dasein would be unfree and completely in the dark. Dasein, as inauthentic speaker, is in only partial darkness, how then does it move into the light, that is, how does it come to terms with its finitude as surely it must if it is to be speaker?

In disclosing the world as world, anxiety discloses the difference between Dasein and thing in bringing this between into focus. It shows Dasein no longer sheltered by the qualifying terms ("ever, never, always" etc.) used to extend its temporal horizon on an infinite plane.

Anxiety pursues Dasein especially where, in new situations, its old formulations of responding fail it. At those times it is literally at a loss for words, for the contextual aspect of the situation as a situation is brought into focus quite clearly. The stereotypes of speech that it has grown quite attached to seem inappropriate, as indeed they are, throwing Dasein back upon itself. Anxiety is not limited to situations in which there is a disturbing element. Even where it feels its happiest, and is most self-assured, this seemingly impregnable position is nevertheless subject to anxiety in expressing the thought that perhaps such happiness won't last. At these moments (both sad and happy), anxiety brings Dasein's finitude to the foreground. But in its attempt to avoid the confrontation with its finitude Dasein mistakes the elements in the situation as the "cause" of anxiety rather than understanding that the root of its discomfort is an ontological one. Thus it rarely confronts the ontological dimension of anxiety as such.

The primary characterization of inauthentic speech, then, is Dasein's flight from its finitude in which it seeks to cover over its being toward death by attempting to refuse acknowledgement of it in its speaking as speaker, in what is spoken about and who is spoken to. Dasein lives in fear of death as that final point at which it will change over from one kind of being to another. Here especially "Das Man" dictates Dasein's attitude in insisting that death does not concern Dasein except as "One" dies. Speaking of death is considered morbid, and so the initial fear of death extends itself to any change at all and from there to the desire to close itself off from the future, which would remind Dasein of its impermanence--and thus of the fact that it has not the immortality of a divinity and that mortality is its ownmost possibility which it cannot flee no matter how hard it tries. It is time that robs Dasein of its ~~imm~~ortality. Inauthentic speech reflects this determination to extend its finite horizon infinitely both in abstracting entities from their ground and pronouncing, with aid of words which display a disregard for openness to the future e.g., never, ever, always, that the past is made present as a static projection distorting time itself.

Authentic speech, as an alternative mode of speaking, reflects Dasein's growing awareness of its finitude. It is an awareness which displays three constituent elements which characterize Dasein as wanderer: a call to such speech; an active response to such an appeal which may be characterized as resolution to take up the burden of its finitude in its speaking; homecoming which brings Dasein, in speaking authentically, to stand in proper relationship to being, thus moving "out of the darkness and into the light". This passage from the Tragic Protest seems especially appropriate here:

...There is fundamentally only one TRAGEDY FOR MAN--THAT OF TIME.

...The tragic protest speaks not in a devil's denial, not in a god's acceptance, but in demand of a human being to which "No" and "Yes" are both available. It is human in its search; tragic in yielding no ultimate find; it is protest in finding itself only in the search it testifies. It ex-presses no dis-possession in a void, no possession in fulness, but AP-PROPRIATION of being in time...

This protecting "ap-proprietation" should be understood...as...turning toward a horizon that is there, available, to be brought into focus but not into existence out of nothing. 1.

It is the ground of its finitude that is shared in being-with-others in speaking authentically. In taking up its own task of

1. Tragic Protest, pg. 254

coming to grips with its finitude, Dasein calls others to their task by letting this ground be "seen" in its speaking, lighting the way of others (showing them the way) toward being. Such an invitation is respectful of the other's potentiality for being a Self whose way toward being might be manifested differently in its particularity.

Resolution thus brings man into position for homecoming, that is of dwelling or residing in the between on which his finitude is based. Such dwelling in coming to speak authentically, exhibits characteristics of both privilege and anxiety, which are interwoven in the authentic human speech. In speaking authentically man "has" the privilege of announcing being by responding to what is given in speech. Man discloses his own nature in disclosing the being of entities in naming things. The meaning of human being is such Saying. Saying is not a possession a man "has" in the sense that it is his property, rather man acknowledges that which is granted to him and in so doing in-habits the way that becomes him.

Authentic speech brings man into the clearing, into the open, a place where man and being be-long. Conscience as the call of care calls man to stand in a proper temporal relationship where time as the three ecstases is unified as the horizon on which being becomes man. Thus man gathers his finitude as his

"ownmost" possibility in which he reaches toward that which reaches him.

Therefore, the fitting relation of the two modes of speech may be seen to be non-exclusive, that is, the transformation of inauthentic speech does not leave such speech behind:

Speech is man's power to anchor himself in being...and yet this human power is ever a quest; it would not be so in a non-temporal realm, where the anchor could stay firm. Man's being in time yields as much hold as withdrawal, allows finding and therein directs searching...²

To insist on such exclusionary action would be just as inauthentic of authentic speech as when inauthentic speech takes the ontic dimension to be the whole of reality.* Communication is not putting down one mode and taking up another, rather, communication is ever man's way to be in which he moves out of the

2. Tragic Protest, pg. 251

- * Richardson raises the question as to whether authentic Dasein would, in forgetting its ontic dimension, be just as inauthentic as inauthentic Dasein is in forgetting the ontological dimension. "...Would not There-being be equally inauthentic if it forgot its ontic dimension and lost itself in a pure mysticism or mythicism of Being?" (Through Phenomenology To Thought, pg. 51)

darkness into the light again and again. Speech discloses human being as both darkness and light. Man speaks both inauthentically and authentically. Communication is that speaking which is both a covering over and an uncovering. This is man's way to be. Speech discloses man's nature as being in decision. Referring to Faust in The Tragic Protest, the following passage eloquently illuminates all that we have so far proposed:

The endeavor of human existence is then suspended between heaven and hell, between light and the night. If negative evil cannot seize him in his being, he nonetheless cannot seize the perfection of good. The sun blinds him, and so does the dark. In his own proper twilight of "reflected colour", the human being is the movement from night into light, the effort to illuminate the search of himself. Man gropes to strive ahead and strives to grope further. He finds that he misses only in reaching for what he misses. ...To be human...he must himself build the path ahead on which he himself is to go. 3

3. *ibid*, pg. 106

Bibliography

- Adamczewski, Z., The Tragic Protest. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1963.
- Adorno, T., The Jargon of Authenticity. Evanston, Ill.: The Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Buber, Martin, Between Man and Man. London: Collins (Fontana Library), 1966.
- Buber, Martin, Eclipse of God. New York: Harper Torch Books, 1957.
- Eliot, T.S., The Complete Poems and Plays. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1962.
- Goethe, Faust, tr. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Anchor Books, 1963.
- Gusdorf, Georges, Speaking (La Parole), tr. P.T. Brockelman. Evanston, Ill.: The Northwestern University Press, 1965.
- Heidegger, Martin, An Introduction to Metaphysics, tr. R. Manheim. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor, 1961.
- Heidegger, Martin, Being and Time, tr. Macquarrie and Robinson. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Heidegger, Martin, Der Feldweg. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klosterman, 1962.
- Heidegger, Martin, Einführung in die Metaphysik. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1953.
- Heidegger, Martin, Essays in Metaphysics: Identity and Difference, tr. K.F. Leidecker, New York: The Philosophic Library, 1960.
- Heidegger, Martin, Existence and Being, tr. Werner Brock. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1970.
- Heidegger, Martin, Holzwege. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klosterman, 1950.
- Heidegger, Martin, Nietzsche. Pfullingen, 1961.
- Heidegger, Martin, Nietzsche, tr. Pierre Klossowski. Gallimard, 1971.
- Heidegger, Martin, On the Way to Language, tr. Hertz. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Heidegger, Martin, Origin of the Work of Art, tr. Z. Adamczewski. Typescript.

Heidegger, Martin, Unterwegs zur Sprache. Pfullingen, 1959.

Heidegger and the Path of Thinking, ed. John Sallis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1970.

Heidegger, Martin, What is Called Thinking, tr. F. Wiecke and J. Glenn Grey. New York: Harper Torch Books, 1968.

Heidegger, Martin, Poetry, Language and Thought, tr. A. Hofstadter. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Keleman, Stanley, Living Your Dying. New York: Random House; Berkeley: Bookworks Books, 1974.

Langan, T., The Meaning of Heidegger. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Mehta, J., The Philosophy of Martin Heidegger. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Neitzsche, F., The Joyful Wisdom, tr. Reinhardt. New York: F. Unger Publishers, 1960.

Plato's Collected Dialogues, ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Carins.

Richardson, Wm. J., Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1963.

Tales of Grimm and Andersen, Selected by Frederick Jacobi. New York: Random House (The Modern Library), 1952.

The Fabric of Existentialism: Philosophical and Literary Sources, ed. Richard Gill and Ernest Sherman. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1973.

The Portable Nietzsche, tr. Walter Kaufmann, New York: The Viking Press, 1968.

The Search for Being, tr. and ed. J. Wilde and W. Kimmel. New York: Noonday Press, 1962.

Thoreau, Henry David, Walden and Other Writings, ed. Brooks Atkinson. New York: Random House (The Modern Library), 1950.

Tillich, Paul, The Courage To Be, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1952.

Essays

Adamczewski, Z., "Being and Sense: in The Journal of Existentialism,
Vol. II, No. 25, Fall, 1966.

Adamczewski, Z., "Martin Heidegger and Man's Way To Be" in Man and World,
Vol. 1, No. 3, 1968, pp. 363-379.

Adamczewski, Z., "Questions in Heidegger's Thought about Being". Typescript.